THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXIV, No. 4 APRIL, 1956

CONTENTS

We Follow Christ ..... *John W. Moran, S.J.* 217

The Immaculate Conception and the Living Church. Part III ..... *Thomas Urban Mullaney, O.P.* 221

The Catholic Altar *Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Harold W. Rambusch* 235

Co-operation of Catholics in Non-Catholic Religious Activities. Part III ..... *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 240

The Priest and Local History ..... *Henry J. Browne* 251

Some Recent Writings in the Field of Fundamental Dogmatic Theology. Part I ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 255

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.*

The Bishop's Teaching Authority 273

Sunday Work 275

Sunday Mass 276

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1956 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Divorce Among Jews 277

Killing in Defense of the Blessed Sacrament 277

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 279

BOOK REVIEWS

The Names of Christ, *by Louis of León* 282

The Saint of the Atom Bomb, *by Josef Schillinger* 283

Introduction to the Science of Metaphysics,
by Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp. 284

For More Vocations, *by Godfrey Poage, C.P.* 286

SPIRITUAL LIFE

A new magazine with a brand new scope, designed to spread *Teresian Spirituality* among priests, religious, and laity, and to make contemplatives in America.

SUBJECTS:
The Intellectual Life
Lay Spirituality
Community
Apostolate
Prayer
Solitude
Sanctity
Perfection, etc.

WRITERS:
Cardinal Piazza
Archbishop Cushing
Bishop Wright
Joe Gabriel of St. M. Magdalen, O.C.D.
Breig Thomas (Kilduff), O.C.D.
Richard (Madden), O.C.D.
Daniel Bruno, O.C.D.
Sargent Conrad Pepler, O.P.
Jordan Aumann, O.P.
Neville James M. Gillis, C.P.
Braybrooke Thomas M. Garrett, S.J.
C. C. Martindale, S.J.
Wm. A. McNamara Theodore Maynard

Jacques Maritain called *Spiritual Life* "an invaluable contribution to satisfy a deep abiding thirst (in Americans) for spiritual experience and profound possibilities for contemplation."

Published quarterly by the Discalced Carmelite Fathers

ONE YEAR — $3.00

SPIRITUAL LIFE
P. O. Box 2068
Milwaukee 1, Wisconsin

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

WE FOLLOW CHRIST

The Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, does not approve of the Catholic Church. According to him: "Perhaps the greatest hindrance to the advance of the Kingdom of God among men lies in the ecclesiastical apartheid of the Catholic Church. It forbids any kind or degree of ecclesiastical partnership between itself and the other churches of Christendom, even the elementary partnership of praying together to our common Lord for grace to grow in partnership."

Now let us see some of the doctrines of those with whom we are asked to have partnership. We may well begin with a quotation from Dr. Fisher's fellow Archbishop of York. "And how can there be a Paradise for any, while there is Hell, conceived as unending torment for some? Each supposedly damned soul was born into the world as a mother's son and Paradise cannot be Paradise for her if her child is in such a Hell. The scheme is unworkable even for omniscience and it offends against the deepest Christian sentiments."[1]

Christ's clear doctrine, therefore, "offends against the deepest Christian sentiments."

But to continue with quotations. The same Archbishop avers, "It seems quite inconceivable that any such entirely coercive argument for the being and character of God should be produced."[2] These sentiments are echoed by E. S. Brightman, "The religious Other *however real* or absolute it *may be* (italics mine) is always an object of faith, never a rational certainty. . . . We can never reach complete proof of his being."[3]

St. Paul to the contrary notwithstanding.

"The concept of an omnipotent and omniscient deity who allows the creation of his will to welter in blood and suffering is intolerable, and theologians have never done more than wiggle against

[1] William Temple, *Nature, Man and God* (London, 1934), p. 454.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[3] E. S. Brightman, *Personality and Religion* (1934), p. 47.

this objection."[4] "The foreknowledge [on the part of God] of free acts is open to serious question."[5]

"There would seem to be no genuine ground for excluding from the Christian fellowship men who are dissatisfied with that formula" [i.e., the Trinitarian] "today, even though they have so far nothing better to put forward."[6]

The Archbishop of Canterbury, of course, would not exclude them.

"Not so long ago theologians understood by the unity of the race its descent from one original pair. . . . But whether we hold monogenesis or polygenesis is no longer a matter of serious concern to faith."[7]

Unless, that is, one holds the doctrine of original sin.

Now let us see what some of those with whom we are urged to form a United Christian Front teach concerning Christ. "The traditional Christology holds that Jesus Christ differs in kind from other human beings, whereas modern Christology believes that Jesus Christ differs from his fellow men, not in kind, but in degree."[8] "As God he would be incapable of sin; as Man he would be capable of sin; as both God and Man he would be both incapable and capable of sin; to such non-sensical conclusion does the original misconception lead us."[9]

Of course, few outside the Catholic Church honor the Mother of God.

"Many who regard the Christian ideal as the only ideal of life reject without hesitation the visible second coming of Our Lord and the story of the Virgin-Birth. Such things do not fit coherently into the mental picture which they have of the universe, as conceived in accordance with the knowledge of the way in which things happen."[10]

Now just what does that mean?

[4] Kirsopp Lake, *Paul, His Heritage and Legacy* (New York, 1934), p. 16.
[5] Albert C. Knudson, *The Doctrine of Redemption* (New York, 1933), p. 155.
[6] M. T. Dunlop in *The Modern Churchman,* XXVI (1936), 303.
[7] A. C. Knudson, *op. cit.,* p. 115.
[8] H. D. A. Major in *The Modern Churchman,* XXV (1936), 678.
[9] J. C. Graham in *Philosophy,* XII (1937), 83.
[10] R. Gladstone-Griffith in *The Modern Churchman,* XXVII (1937), 433.

It is unnecessary here to refute these opinions. But I wish first to quote a few statements of Christ our Lord. "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" (*Matt.* 28: 18-20). *All things.* Even the existence of hell, even if the thought of it is terrifying.

"Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, and he who does not believe will be condemned" (*Mark* 16:16). Therefore there is a definite number of truths to be believed. A definite refusal to believe any one of them means condemnation.

Next let us consider the teaching of the Apostles, for they best understood the doctrines of Christ, and had a direct mandate to promulgate them.

The Apostle of the Gentiles gives a résumé of the fundamental truths. Writing to the Corinthians he states:

> For I delivered to you first of all, what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, and after that to the Eleven. Then he was seen by more than five hundred at one time, many of whom are with us still, but some have fallen asleep. After that he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles. And last of all, as by one born out of due time, he was seen also by me. For I am the least of the Apostles, and am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God. . . . Whether then it is I or they, so we preach and so you have believed (*I Cor.* 15: 1-11).

Every one of these truths is denied today, and we do not propose to form a Popular Front with the advocates of denial.

Next we can quote the Prince of the Apostles. "But there were false prophets also among the people, just as among you *there will be lying teachers* who will bring in destructive sects. They will even disown the Lord who bought them,[11] thus bringing on swift destruction" (*II Pet.* 2: 1).

St. Jude states, "I find it necessary to write to you, exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

[11] They deny our Lord's divinity. But "Whoever disowns me before men, I in turn will deny him before my Father in heaven" (*Matt.* 10:33).

For certain men have stealthily entered in. . . . ungodly men who turn the grace of God into wantonness and disown our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" (v. 4).

Finally we come to St. John. "Many false prophets have gone forth into the world. By this is the spirit of God known . . . every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come into the world, is of God. And every spirit that severs Jesus, is not of God, but is of Antichrist" (*I John* 4:1-3). Also "Many deceivers have gone forth into the world who do not confess Jesus as the Christ coming in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the Antichrist" (*II John* 1:7).

Now whom had John in mind when writing his gospel and epistles? Irenaeus informs us. "John the disciple of the Lord announcing this faith, wishing by the announcement of the gospel to dispel that error, which had been implanted in men by Cerinthus."[12]

What was the central doctrine of Cerinthus? Again to quote Irenaeus:

> A certain Cerinthus in Asia taught that the world had not been made by God. . . . Jesus moreover, he added was not born of a virgin (for that seemed impossible to him); he was the son of Joseph and Mary in the same way as other men, and was more powerful in justice and prudence and wisdom among men. And after his baptism there descended upon him, from that principality which is above all things, Christ in the form of a dove; and then announced the unknown Father and worked miracles, at the end Christ flew back from Jesus, and Jesus suffered[13] and arose.[14]

In other words, according to Cerinthus, Jesus "differed from his fellow men, not in kind but in degree." The so-called "Modern Christology" is as modern as Cerinthus.

JOHN W. MORAN, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Massachusetts

[12] Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses,* III, 11, 1; *MPG,* VII, 79.

[13] Thus of course the passion of Jesus was useless to save us. Hence St. John wrote, "This is he who came in water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in water only, but in the water and the blood" (*I John* 5:6).

[14] *Ibid.,* I, 26, 1; *MPG,* VII, 686.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION AND THE LIVING CHURCH

Part III

2. The Immaculate Conception and the birth of the Church

By birth we mean the emergence of a distinct fulness (at least relative fulness) of life achieved by the spirit's complete, definitive possession and animation of its body, so that there is thenceforth a distinct subject of fulness of specific being, marked by distinctness of activity. In bodily generation birth includes, and has as its most evident sign, the separation of offspring from parent.

To the question, in what consisted the birth of the Mystical Body of Christ, the Christian tradition summed up by the Holy Father, Pius XII, gives a most clear answer. "The Divine Redeemer began the building of the mystical temple of the Church when by His preaching He made known His precepts; He completed it when He hung glorified on the Cross. . . . that He completed His work on the gibbet of the Cross is the unanimous teaching of the holy Fathers who assert that the Church *was born* from the side of the Saviour on the Cross. . . . It was . . . through His blood that *the Church was enriched with the fullest communication of the Holy Spirit.*"[23] This is why at the moment of Christ's dying the veil of the Temple was rent from top even to the bottom.[24] This rending signified the breaking down of the barrier—the barrier which was sin—between God and man. In that instant, all obstacles having been removed, the minds and hearts of men having been, by the Lord, readied, the Spirit of God burst in upon the world. The body, the cells that had been organized by the Saviour's teaching were now definitively possessed by the life of God. The dying breath of Christ was, so to say, the first life's breath of His Church: by it He breathed upon His Mystical Body His own spirit of divine life. Once, of old, "the Lord God . . . breathed into [man's] face and man became a living soul."[25] Now again on Calvary God breathed upon man, and

[23] Cf. *Mystici corporis.*
[24] *Matt.* 28: 51.
[25] *Gen.* 2: 7.

again man became a living soul. Life, new life, surged through that body of men that is the Mystical Body.

The moment of the Church's birth is indisputably fixed. It is the moment of definitive fulness of life: the moment when "the Church was enriched with the fullest communication of the Holy Spirit"; the moment when the Blood of Christ, poured out into the world, carried into the world of men the fulness of the Spirit.

Notice especially the role of Christ's suffering and death—His redemptive Passion—with respect to the birth of His Church. His anguish of death was its struggle to life; His cry of death its cry of new life; His surrender of the spirit its possession of the Spirit. The death of the Lord was the passageway to the life of the Church; for His sacrificial death was a theandric act whereby in the name of men there was offered to the divine Father love, worship, satisfaction for sin, all of literally infinite value. Therefore that death simultaneously removed the last obstacle to the Church's full, perfect life, by removing by way of satisfaction the impediment that is sin. It established, by way of merit, a claim in most strict justice that the will of Christ be fulfilled,[26] His will "that they may be one in us,"[27] one in the unity of God's Spirit.

Now in the removal of those barriers (by way of satisfaction) *and in the earning of that claim* (by way of merit) *the Immaculate Conception of Mary was inextricably bound up.*

Eternally the Father had joined in one and the same divine decree Christ and the Mother of Christ, so that, as apart from the Virgin's consent there would have been no Incarnation, so apart from her compassion there would have been no meriting and satisfying for all men. It is eternally true that God never needs our Lady or any other creature; but it is also eternally true that He freely chose to constitute as principle of the whole order of redemption not His incarnate Son alone, but rather Christ and our Lady as *one* total principle.

As therefore Christ redeemed us, Mary co-redeemed us. As Christ's Passion condignly merited all graces for all men and therefore merited the full possession of the Church by the Spirit, so also Mary congruously merited that. As Christ's Passion satisfied for all sin by perfect and excessive satisfaction, thereby

[26] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 48, a. 1.

[27] *John* 17:21.

removing all obstacles to the indwelling of the Spirit; so Mary congruously and inadequately produced the same effect. As Christ's Passion was a true, perfect sacrifice which infallibly and infinitely placated the Father and (to speak improperly) thereby moved His divine heart fully to enliven the Church by His own divine life: so again Mary's Compassion was an internal sacrifice attaining the same result, though in a far less perfect way.[28] The Compassion of Mary is not merely a reflection of the Passion of Christ: it is, by God's own decree, a part of the price of divine life for men, it is an essential requisite to the birth of the Church.

Now what and whence was Mary's Compassion? This we answer by analogy with the Saviour's Passion. The suffering and death of Christ was properly the action, the suffering, of His human nature. Divinity cannot suffer or die. So it was that the Passion came forth from human principles of acting and enduring, i.e., from the virtues of the Lord's created soul. Similarly Mary's Compassion, her suffering and eager willingness to suffer with Christ, was the activity of her human virtues. But these, we have seen, are substantially identical with her Immaculate Conception, formally considered.

Thus her Compassion, her co-redemptive activity, was a necessary condition of, a necessary anguish for, bringing forth in fulness of life the Mystical Body of Christ; and her Compassion *was* her Immaculate Conception at work for us, for our fulness of life; for obviously that activity was elicited by the virtues which go to constitute her sanctified conception.

In this matter, as in the question of the conception of the Church, it is clear that Mary's maternal role is based upon her Immaculate Conception not only as to the grace which substantially constitutes that first privilege but also as to its mode of preservation. Here, too, there is special reason for this. First, our Lady's role in the birth of the Church is, as we have just seen, really identical with her activity of co-redeeming us from sin, and from slavery to Satan. That activity was her part in Christ's conquest of the devil. As Pius IX pointed out, it required her own complete freedom from sin, and from the dominion of

[28] Cf. Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, pp. 323 ff.

Satan (that is, it required that grace *preserve* her from any taint whatsoever); for otherwise her victory, or association in victory, would not have been the complete triumph foretold by God in the proto-Evangelium.[29] Secondly, as Mother, as the woman associated in communicating completeness of life to the Mystical Body, Mary ought to have had fulness of life in herself. She who was in humanity's name to co-satisfy for all sin ought to have been without sin: the mediatrix of life is not fittingly the victim and co-conspirator with the deviser of death. The Mother of all living is fitly herself totally without spiritual death.[30]

Certain aspects of the co-redemptive activity of the Immaculate Conception can be emphasized here in order to underscore their maternal mode.

First, the Compassion of Mary proceeded *efficiently* from her Immaculate Conception. This is merely to repeat that her Compassion was really a series of sanctified, virtuous human acts; and that these acts were elicited by their corresponding virtues every one of which was part of the Immaculate Conception. As therefore a parent by efficient *physical* action works toward the birth of her child so did our Lady by efficient, though entirely spiritual, activity contribute to the full life of the Church.[31]

Second, this activity was, again, specifically *womanly;* for, again, it presupposed her status as the woman who is *Mother* of God, *Queen* of the universe. It presupposed her *Motherhood* for only as Mother of the Divine Redeemer could Mary co-offer as something of her own Christ, the victim and price of redemption. Mary's personal virtue made her Christ's, not Christ hers; but by her Motherhood He was something of herself, one with respect to whom she had real maternal rights which she could and did will to sacrifice. Her co-redemptive activity presupposed also her status as *Queen,* i.e. as the womanly associate of the divine, *de jure* King of all things, Christ: for only in her character of a sovereign, not in a merely private capacity, could she act in the name of the whole community of men, the collectivity of Christ. Third, her activity was not independent or self-sufficient; it was a dependent co-operation in the redeeming and enlivening of the Church wrought by Christ. It was *not independent* because Mary

[29] *DB* 1641.

[30] Cf. Roschini, *op. cit.*, II, 197 ff.

[31] Cf. *ibid.*, 345 ff.

herself had to be redeemed by the Saviour of all men; it was by participation from Christ the Redeemer that our Lady had both the right and the willingness to share in His redeeming act by which the Church came into fulness of sanctified life. Hers was a *co-operation* because the sanctification Mary co-offered was not distinct from that which her Son offered—His life; and the merit, the title she earned regarded, though in a different way, the same thing His merit regarded—the final, complete coming of the Spirit to possess the body of Christ's believers.

Thus the Immaculate Conception at work in Mary's co-redemptive activity is rightly called a part of her maternity of the Mystical Body. For it was womanly, co-operative activity efficiently elicited by her with a view to the emergence of the Mystical Body in its definitive fulness of life. That is motherly activity indeed.

Last, in this matter it is noteworthy that Mary's co-operation here, too, terminates properly in the moral order. For, as we have seen, what is involved in her actions for the birth of the Church is especially her co-operation in the Saviour's meriting for all men, and satisfying for all sin. The latter removed the obstacle to the "fullest communication of the Spirit" to men; the former was a claim demanded by the Father as the definitive price, necessary for the full sending of the Holy Ghost. But since both merit and satisfaction are properly moral in character, so was our Lady's sharing in that satisfaction and merit something of the specifically moral order also She did not, could not, physically bring about the complete and final mission of the Holy Spirit to the Church; but the absolute limit of what was possible to her, that she did do.

3. The Immaculate Conception and the nurturing of the Church

Motherhood is not abruptly ended by the birth of the offspring. In some sense, motherhood goes on forever. And this is most proper; for in the natural order parent and child are linked, originally, by literally substantial ties. The child is of the very substance of his mother; yet eventually his own personal distinctness demands the severance of such bond. So in the order of affection there is, as it were, a reuniting ordained by nature itself which recaptures in that order something of the intimate oneness that primitively obtained between mother and son. The maternal

manifestation of this unity of affections is, of course, the enduring and vitally important contribution made by the mother to the perfect growth, development, and maturity of her child. And that contribution is for the sake of his physical, moral, and spiritual welfare.

Mary's motherhood of the Church, unlike natural motherhood, is not originally fleshly, nor is the Church of the substance of her person. Rather hers is from the outset an entirely spiritual maternity. Thus its origin, its high-point on Calvary and its aftermath until the end of time are all in the affective order, in the acts, that is to say, of her soul. Yet that implies on Mary's part no lesser love for the Mystical Body of Christ than a natural mother would have for her son—rather the reverse. For our Lady's love of the Church is not merely a quasi-substitute for a now severed substantial bond: her love for the Church now and unto the end is really identical with her original conceiving and bearing of it. That very act whereby she co-operated in the enlivening of the Mystical Body endures now in her glorified soul, and is the living principle of all her interest in, all her present activity for, the Church's welfare. To gauge the intensity of that love, that vital interest, we need recall merely that it is the same act of love whereby she loves her God, her Christ; for it is the identical act of love which underlay her assent to the Divine Motherhood; it is that almost incredible love whereby she eagerly assented even to the sacrificial death of her Son. That love is her maternal love of the Mystical Body now. Rightly, then, we expect to find that our Lady's maternal activity for the Church did not cease on Calvary. The incredible thing would be not that our blessed Mother is deeply concerned about that Body which is, so to say, the prolongation of the Humanity of Christ, which she bore, and then co-sacrificed for us; the incredible thing would be indifference on her part to the outcome of the life-work and death-work of her Son, indifference on her part to that Body which constitutes one Mystical Person with the Son of her womb.

So all Christian tradition has had a deep, connatural sureness of the enduring character of Mary's Motherhood. That sureness is manifest in the writings of the very earliest Fathers of the Church; manifested without interruption in Christian theological development; manifested above all in the official teaching of the Church.

The special point of emphasis here is the dependence on the Immaculate Conception of our Lady's enduring maternal activities on behalf of the Church. Our question, then, must be: What is this "enduring maternal activity on behalf of the Church"?

In the natural order maternal activity for the welfare of the offspring embraces all a mother's activities which look to the perfect "humanization" of her child; her care that he shall have such health and vitality of body as becomes a man, such intellectual development as is properly human, such moral virtues as the special demands of complex nature impose. In a similar way Mary's maternal activities for the Church must embrace all her intervention for perfecting the divine life, the life of the Spirit of God, in the body of believers.

What is "divine life in the body of believers"? It includes absolutely every supernatural habit and activity, for "the supernatural" is specified by the divine formally as divine and uncreated. Consequently, Mary's present maternal activity for the Church includes all her intervention for the supernatural life of the members of the Church.

Now it is the certain and unanimous teaching of theologians that our Lady's causality is involved in the dispensations of absolutely all supernatural gifts to all men. If, for the moment, we restrict our considerations to her causality of all grace in all the actual members of the Mystical Body of Christ, we can say, "there, most certainly, is the present maternal activity of Mary for the Church."

In reality, the dispensing of any grace to any member of the Church looks to the perfecting of the life of the entire Mystical Body and so, in Mary, is a maternal act for the welfare of the Church. For every grace is either habitual or actual, or social (charismatic). If *charismatic* it is by definition, by essence, a contribution to the welfare of the Church as a social body. If *habitual* it involves a quasi-permanent intensification of the life of the Spirit in the members upon whom that grace is bestowed. Somewhat as in the natural body the increased health of any member, or part, is for the sake of, and directly contributory to, the well-being of the organism as such; so the greater life of the Spirit in any member of the Church looks to and serves the welfare of the whole Body. A ready measure of this truth is that increase of

grace always involves increase of charity; and increase of charity demands the increased activity of the member for the welfare of the Mystical Body since that Body is one with the integral Christ Himself, a special object of charity. Therefore the Church as such infallibly is benefited by the increased grace of one of its members.

If the grace newly dispensed be *actual* then as a minimum it must include some sort of motion toward the deepening of faith; otherwise it would not specifically be supernatural. Deepened faith means a greater explicit subjection of mind to God, a more perfect dominion of the Spirit over its own member, the more perfect cohesion of the members with the rest of the Body, and of the rest of the Body with that member. Thus in varying degrees, all the graces for members of the Church that Mary seeks, obtains, and dispenses look to the welfare of the Church as such and so pertain to her properly maternal work.

But it is even true that graces bestowed, through her intercession, upon persons who are not actually members of the Church, have reference to the welfare of the Church. Thus, her part in obtaining graces even for such persons is an aspect of her maternal activity on behalf of the Mystical Body.

For there is now no grace for any man that is not Christian grace—grace, that is, of conformity with Christ, grace that comes through Christ. *All* grace is ordination to, or achievement of, sanctity in Christ. But as Christ "is not complete if only His visible human nature is considered, or if only His divine invisible nature . . . but He is one through the union of both and one in both, so it is with His Mystical Body."[32] There is no interior invisible union, through grace, with Christ which is not *ipso facto* an ordination to His visible Mystical Body. The two, interior union with Christ, and visible union with His Church, mutually complement and perfect each other: there is a divinely established and inescapable nexus between them. Though in particular cases one may be had without the actuality of the other, as a human soul may exist outside its body, there is, nevertheless, an order of each to the other, as the separated soul retains, and is, relation to a human body.

The grace therefore obtained by our Lady for non-members of the Church is a grace of conformity to Christ, a grace really con-

[32] Encyclical *Satis cognitum*.

taining true ordination of the recipient of the grace to the Mystical Body, which is the visible Church.[33] Such graces look ultimately to the whole body of believers, look to the increase of that body. These graces, too, are sought by Mary in her maternal role of acting always for the well-being of the Mystical Body of Christ.

We have then this truth: Mary's universal causality of all graces for all men is, under the aspect of its being directed to the welfare of the Mystical Body of Christ, her maternal activity for the perfection and intensification of life within that Mystical Body. It is at once clear how far-reaching, how incessant, how urgent for the continued life and activity of the Mystical Body her motherly intervention is: for, God so willing, without that intervention there would be in the Church of God and in the souls of men neither life, nor vigor, nor sanctity. There would be only the arid deathliness of man's repeated sin.

But—this is the crucial realization—all of Mary's present activity of obtaining graces for men, of dispensing the supernatural largesse of God to men is the activity of her personal virtues, especially of her virtue of charity. We have seen that her charity and all her other virtues are parts of her Immaculate Conception, all are rooted in and quasi-properties of the grace which is the formal constitutive of her Immaculate Conception. Thus again this third aspect of her motherhood of the Church is efficiently principled by that same original privilege with which the eternal God began the splendor that is Mary.

The following points help to sharpen the realization of the truly maternal character of our Lady's intervention in the distribution of graces.

That this activity includes womanly co-operation in the communication of life—the notion of motherhood—is most evident. Hers is first a *co-operation,* not a self-sufficient bestowal of divine life; for her power to intervene and her every act of intervention are caused in her by God's prior grace given to her. Hers is certainly co-operation in the *communication of life;* for grace *is* life, divine life, in a created sharing. "This is eternal life, that they might know Thee, the one true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ."[34] Hers is lastly a *womanly* intervention. It rests upon her womanly office as Co-redemptrix and Queen; for only

[33] Encyclical *Mystici corporis.*

[34] *John* 17:3.

one who has earned title to all graces can by right dispose of all graces; and only one who is Sovereign in the Church can by right provide for the general welfare of the Church. But it is womanly especially because it is a work of tender love, of merciful beseeching, and of everlasting fidelity. The Church of God on earth and the kingdom of God in heaven are peopled by vast multitudes who, nearly contradictorily, have walked, or are walking, God-ward in a baffling maze of weaknesses and of hope, of failure, and of high courage. The failure has been, and is, their own: the courage is the womanly touch of Mary. For weakness and failure can seem small things beside that one whose solicitude is womanly, and, therefore, everlasting and victorious.

In considering the role of Mary and of her Immaculate Conception in both the conception and birth of the Church I have pointed out that that role is properly moral rather than physical; for while the grace of her Conception physically elicited the activities in which consist her conceiving and bearing the Church, still that conceiving and that bearing are *moral* aspects of the activities in question.

Is it true also of Mary's nurturing the Church that it is of the moral rather than of the physical order? The question is equivalent to asking, "Is our Lady's activity in the dispensing of graces a moral cause of grace; or is Mary also a physical instrument in the transmission of grace?"

The answer is controverted, much controverted today especially. All would concede what has been written or implied above, viz. that by her intercession before Christ and, with Christ, before the Divine Father, Mary does exercise moral causality in the production of grace in our souls and in the Church of God. All would concede further that there is no absolute impossibility involved in our Lady's being a physical instrument of grace. What is controverted is the question of fact, namely, has God *de facto* established the Holy Virgin as a physical efficient instrument in the production of grace? Into that controversy we shall not enter here as it is not germane to our problem. Mary's motherhood of the Church is certainly of the moral order as to the conception, bearing and nurturing of the Church. Whether it is also physical with respect to the last aspect of her maternity is a distinct, complex problem which does not concern us directly.

Lastly in this question, is there any connection between Mary's nurturing of the Mystical Body and the modality of preservation found in her grace of conception? If there were no such connection, the absolute perfection of the Immaculate Conception would not be bound up in this motherly activity of our Lady.

Connection there is. For our Lady's whole concern is this, that the Church shall be indeed "not having spot or wrinkle"[35]—for this is God's ideal for the Church. And Mary herself is "without spot" precisely by the preservation wrought in her through her original grace. It is that grace *as preservative* which, so to say, equips her for her activity of producing in the Church the spotless perfection of life which is found, by a certain priority, in her, mother of the living Church.

4. The Likeness of the Church to Mary's Immaculate Conception

It is an indispensable requisite of motherhood that the life communicated by the woman be like to her own life. We have already seen this: "Generation is essentially assimilative. . . . It produces to the image and likeness of the one generating, as being manifestive of the generator."[36] It remains therefore lastly and briefly to determine whether the life of grace co-operatively communicated by Mary to the Church does in fact make the Mystical Body be like unto our Lady; and since we are considering in Mary's maternity especially the role of her Immaculate Conception we must determine in particular whether the grace bestowed upon the Church through our Lady's intervention fashions the Church in the likeness of Mary's original grace and holiness.

From general considerations it can readily be shown that this is the case.

We have first that by her Immaculate Conception our Lady was already "full of grace." When the Angel saluted her by those very words the grace so acknowledged in her was the grace of her Immaculate Conception: for the special sanctification involved in her Divine Maternity was not yet hers. But what was the character of her original fulness of grace? We have the words of Pope Pius IX "He (God) filled her *far more than all angelic spirits and all the saints* with an abundance of heavenly gifts in such manner

[35] *Eph.* 5:27.

[36] John of St. Thomas, *loc. cit.*

that . . . she might display such fulness of . . . holiness that, under God, none greater is known, and which, God excepted, no one can attain even in thought . . . *she approaches as near to God Himself as possible* considering that she has only a created nature."[37]

It is certain that our Blessed Mother's grace is specifically the same as the grace of all other men, specifically the same as the grace which is the proximate principle of the sanctified life and activity of the Church. It is also certain that the Holy Ghost as the Divine principle of life indwells in the souls of men and in the Mystical Body of Christ through grace, and especially through His Gifts. It follows immediately that the supernatural life produced in us through our Lady's co-operation is specifically the same as her own sanctified life: and that the Holy Spirit's animation of the Mystical Body is like to His indwelling in the soul of Mary.

But it follows also that her sanctity, her subjection to the Spirit of life is a certain maximum since "under God none greater is known" and ". . . she approaches as near to God Himself as possible." Thus her life of holiness, her Immaculate Conception, is indeed a perfect exemplar, a divinely established norm or pattern in the likeness of which is fashioned all sanctity of all men, and the very life of the Church. Notice that Mary is not merely like the Church, and the Church like Mary, in her grace of Conception: more than that her Immaculate Conception is the maximum, the limit beyond which no man and no body of men, not even the Mystical Body, can reach, for "under God none greater is known" and to her splendor of life "no one, God excepted, can attain even in thought." These words apply to the Church collectively taken as well as to individuals in the Church. So our Lady *by her grace of Conception* in principle attained all the fulness of holiness, all the subjection to the Spirit which is possible to created persons. By her Immaculate Conception she *is* the ideal of created holiness concretized; she *is* the life of sanctity, which is the life of the Church, achieved, enshrined. The Church's life must be in the pattern of her life: for God Himself has from eternity established

[37] *DB* 1641.

her as the created person who should attain *ab initio* the fulness that all others should, as children, seek to imitate.[38]

The grace of the Immaculate Conception is indeed maternal with respect to the souls of men and the Body of the Church.[39] Her grace of conception is a certain principle of all grace, a maturity of sanctity which was always ready to fructify in the production of new life, new sanctity. Her grace of conception surrounds, embraces,

[38] The specific likeness of the life of the Church to the spiritual life of our Lady can be shown especially from an analysis of both the formal and final causes of grace. However, a complete consideration of the point would unduly lengthen this study.

[39] Throughout this paper the emphasis has been placed—and deliberately so—on positively showing that our Blessed Lady is in a true, analogous way Mother of the Mystical Body. We have not been concerned therefore with the refutation of possible objections.

Yet notice ought to be taken of the most difficult single objection to our thesis. That objection can be stated roughly in this way. The notion of motherhood certainly implies a principle which is anterior, extrinsic, to the offspring. But our Lady was herself a member contained within the Body of the Church not therefore extrinsic and anterior to it. Hence she cannot be said to be the mother of the Mystical Body.

In the natural order she who begets offspring—a mother—is indeed extrinsic to those whom she begets. But separateness of parent and offspring, with the consequent necessity that the parent be anterior and extrinsic to the offspring, is not required by the nature of generation or parenthood as such but is necessary in animal and human generations only because of the exigencies of matter. But as St. Thomas so beautifully explains in *Contra Gentiles,* the more perfect is the generation the more one with the parent is the offspring, so that in divinity there is absolutely no separation; the identical nature of the Father *is* the nature of His Divine Son. In the more perfect created imitations of the Divine generation—the act of knowing—the term of generation, the word, is not extrinsic to the knower but within him.

We can say, then, that our Blessed Mother is not extrinsic to the Church, or separate from it, and yet is the Mother of the Mystical Body somewhat as her Divine Son as Head of the Church is not extrinsic to it, yet is its Founder. For our Lady's Maternity of the Mystical Body imitates something of the perfection of those nobler forms of generation in which the offspring (the generated) is not separate from the generator.

Generation again does not of itself demand that parent be anterior to offspring, as the Divine Father is not anterior to His Son. So in a sense the Mystical Body and Mary are simultaneous: for she is a principal member of it. Yet with respect to the great body of the faithful Mary was temporally anterior in her animation by the Spirit. But this is simply the sign of her nobler sanctity and office in the Church, not a requisite constitutive thereof.

and includes the life of the entire Church and so fashions its own likeness forever. Once the Immaculate One co-operated in forming the physical Body of Christ, God's Son; and formed It doubtless in likeness to herself. Now and in every generation she co-operates in forming, perfecting His Mystical Body; and this too is formed in likeness of her. For she, Mother of divine grace, is Mother of divine life—where ever among men is found divine life there is found too the likeness of the Mother. The degree of our likeness to her is the measure of our grandeur; and the measure of our child-like intimacy with her is our hope of salvation.

THOMAS URBAN MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

THE CATHOLIC ALTAR

Only in recent years has the legislation governing the construction and furnishing of altars been generally available. The interpretation and application of this legislation presents problems. The altar of the Blessed Sacrament, the main altar and altars in general are subject to specific regulations. In current practice, the main altar is also the altar of the Blessed Sacrament. The following are some observations on practical solutions to the construction problems involved.

Canon Law mentions very little about altars except to define the difference between a fixed and a portable altar. A fixed altar must have the *stipes* (legs or supports) permanently cemented to the *mensa* (table or top). It should be consecrated. Both the *mensa* and *stipes* must be of natural stone. There is no specific direction as to the foundation and some authorities would even contend that a fixed altar could theoretically be taken up in an aeroplane. There is considerable symbolism involved. The five crosses usually carved on the *mensa* represent Christ's wounds, the three altar cloths His shrouds, and the four *stipes* the Evangelists.

Canon Law also states that the main altar should be dedicated to the patron saint of the church. Nowhere is there any statement to the effect that there should be any picture or statue of the titular in connection with the altar, but it may seem natural that such an indication of the dedication would be appropriate. This is, of course, a matter of opinion. The various laws and rules governing altar construction are, in some respects, similar to the rules of grammar and rhetoric. They are clear, but leave a great deal of latitude in the matter of interpretation to the clergy and designer.

An altar is termed portable no matter what its size or material, unless it can be and is consecrated. In a fixed altar, the *mensa,* that is the altar table and its supports, is considered the altar. All unconsecrated altars are altars only by virtue of the altar stone which is laid on or set in the altar table. It is the altar stone which is the altar, and it is termed a "portable altar."

The *predella* or foot-pace is a necessary part of the altar. It is the step upon which the priest stands when saying Mass. The number of steps is discretionary, except that it must be uneven

and that the altar of the Blessed Sacrament and the main altar should have more steps than other altars in the same church. Most authorities suggest that the *predella* be the width of the altar, or only a few inches wider. The server is properly standing on the step below the priest on various occasions. The use of very wide *predellas* is often seen in contemporary planning, but this practice has some disadvantages. Space is normally at a premium and is of greater use on the floor of the sanctuary than in the width of the *predella.* The depth of the *predella* is usually about four feet, except in a cathedral, where greater depth is desirable.

The medieval practice was to place the altar in a deep sanctuary. The modern tendency is to bring the altar as near to the congregation as possible, in the interest of maximum participation. Except in a cathedral, there is very little need of much space between the altar steps and the altar rail. The torch bearers and the marriage principals represent the greatest demand upon this area. These can be comfortably accommodated in as little as ten feet. This is one of the situations which is entirely a matter of discretion, but contemporary designers, even in secular buildings, strive to bring the action near to the public. With the importance given to the participation of the congregation by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in *Mediator Dei* it appears to be of particular moment that the placing of the altar in the contemporary sanctuary be given due consideration.

The recent regulations concerning the safety of the tabernacle key are so well known that discussion seems unnecessary, but some confusion does exist as to the position of the tabernacle. The directions say: on the table of the altar. "Table" leads to some confusion for many feel that the tabernacle must be on the *mensa.* Authorities, however, state that the gradine is definitely permitted. Placing the tabernacle on the *mensa* is all but impossible, other rules considered, for the tabernacle must be securely attached to the altar and the *mensa* must be covered completely by the altar cloths. If the tabernacle is placed on the *mensa,* the altar cloths would have to be cut around it. The *mensa* would then not be completely covered by altar cloths. A very low (for example, one inch) gradine serves the purpose in a practical manner. It gives the impression of an intimate relation between the tabernacle and the *mensa.* It also provides a desirable guide in placing the altar cloths.

That the tabernacle must be of safe and strong construction is generally admitted. The question of veils is less well understood and accepted. An exterior veil must be used no matter how rich the material and the design of the tabernacle. The veil is the only positive sign of the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, for lamps may be used before all altars as long as there are more lamps before the Blessed Sacrament than before the other altars. They must be uneven in number and some designers find several lamps across the sanctuary enhance the apparent importance of the altar.

When the Blessed Sacrament is removed from the tabernacle, the veil must also be removed. The veil must cover the entire tabernacle, top and sides, like a tent. The term used for the veil, *conopaeum,* meaning tent, recalls the sojourn of the Jews in the desert, who were commanded to gather the manna and preserve it in their tents over the Sabbath.

Unfortunately, the modern pressure of sales tends toward the design and display of tabernacles of rich and protruding exterior design. Such tabernacles often make the use of a proper veil almost impossible. Further, when such tabernacles have been acquired they are, to some, a temptation to dispense with the veil. Since the tabernacle usually contains the Blessed Sacrament continuously, except on Holy Thursday and Good Friday, it would seem better if the tabernacles were designed to accept a veil gracefully and look their best with the veil in place.

The veil may be white, or the color of the day. Here it is a matter of the judgment of the pastor. White is probably permitted at all times, because white is the color of the Blessed Sacrament. Psychologically, the color of the day, on the other hand, adds interest and the changes of color attract attention and make the entire setting less static.

The interior veil, which is no substitute for the *conopaeum* or outer veil, often presents problems. It is difficult both to install and maintain. No interior veil is required if the interior of the tabernacle is gold or gilded, or lined with white silk.

While the directions for the color of vestments and *antependia* permit the use of gold for certain colors, no mention is made of gold for the outer tabernacle veil. The veil should, however, be white during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, no matter what the color of the vestments. There is a positive direction stating

that the tabernacle veil may not be omitted even if the tabernacle be very precious. The *antependium* may, however, be omitted if the altar front is precious. The *antependium* actually vests the altar. The regulations are not always taken too seriously. Many, who would never omit the use of the proper ecclesiastical titles, fail to realize that veils, *antependia* and canopies are similar indications of respect due the Blessed Sacrament.

In the past it has been the custom to have several tabernacles, often one on each altar. This is not specifically forbidden, but as the Blessed Sacrament may only be reserved on one altar at a time, additional tabernacles are unnecessary. The multiplication of tabernacles has often led to the abuse of standing statues on the tabernacles. An extra tabernacle is needed for the *Missa pro pace*[1] and an urn or tabernacle for Holy Thursday. These occasions are, however, exceptional and are well served by portable vessels. Space is, in most cases, very valuable and the building of tabernacles on a side altar pre-empts precious area. Portable tabernacles can be placed on the *mensa* of the altar for these special occasions, for Mass may not be said on the altar of reposition on Holy Thursday.

The original law for candlesticks and crucifix calls for six candlesticks graduated in height, the tallest in the center. The base of the crucifix is described as similar to the candlesticks, thus it is as though there were seven candlesticks, six of which hold candles and one of which supports the crucifix. The law states that the candlesticks must not exceed the height of the crucifix base. This is usually interpreted to mean that the flame of the candle should not extend above the arms of the crucifix. The law calling for graduated candlesticks has never been revoked and such an arrangement is quite proper when in the mind of the pastor it seems desirable. However, there is definite legislation permitting the current practice of having all six candlesticks of the same height. The candlesticks and crucifix should stand on the same level and be in a straight line, except when the Bishop Ordinary is pontificating, when the crucifix is moved forward and a seventh candlestick is placed in line with the six. When there is an altar of the Blessed Sacrament, the law assumes that there will be no tabernacle on the main altar. This arrangement simplifies the ceremony

[1] Prescribed for the Forty Hours' Devotion.

at a Pontifical Mass, but is rarely practical in our parish churches or our cathedrals, which usually also serve as parish churches. It has, however, been found possible in some cases to construct the cathedral tabernacle so that it can be attached to another altar during pontifical ceremonies.

Another mark of honor due the Blessed Sacrament is the canopy or *ciborium*. These are of various forms and should cover the altar and *predella*, at least the celebrant. The most dignified form of *ciborium* or civory is supported on four columns. These if correctly placed do not interfere with the ceremony, for the ceremoney takes into account their existence. The regulations allow for any kind of a covering of adequate size and location. It may be hung from the ceiling or bracketed from the *reredos* or the wall.

There has been evident a tendency to speak of the "liturgical" altar and imply thereby an altar having a dossal and canopy, but the dossal is not a required part of the altar. An altar on which Mass is said is a "liturgical" altar, whether it is correctly built or not.

Actually, in most churches there is only one principal altar and it is both the main altar and the altar of the Blessed Sacrament. Its importance vastly outweighs that of any of the other altars. It is, therefore, unfortunate when the side altars or shrines are either so big or so prominently placed that they detract from the main altar. Upon entering the church only one thing should dominate, viz., the altar. The side altars in common practice are rarely used for Mass, but serve largely as devotional shrines. This use as shrines is best served when the side altars are outside of the sanctuary proper. They then become more intimate and approachable. On the other hand, the main altar gains prominence when it alone is in the sanctuary. It follows, with such an arrangement, that the altar rail encloses only the main altar and the sanctuary. This in turn adds to the feeling of participation, for the congregation receives Holy Communion from a rail closely identified with the altar at which Mass is being celebrated.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.
HAROLD W. RAMBUSCH

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

CO-OPERATION OF CATHOLICS IN NON-CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Part III

In two previous articles[1] we considered some of the moral problems pertinent to the co-operation of Catholics in non-Catholic religious activities, such as the building of Protestant churches, the selling of articles to be used in non-Catholic religious functions, the advertising of non-Catholic services, etc. It is the purpose of this article to discuss several other particular problems that are likely to be proposed to the priests of our country, and to essay a solution that will represent the proper Catholic attitude and will serve as a prudent guide for priests and people.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE Y.M.C.A.

Membership in the Young Men's Christian Association (Y.M.C.A.) and its corresponding female organization, the Young Women's Christian Association (Y.W.C.A.), has been a topic of considerable discussion among Catholic priests in our land, and it would seem that the practice of our people in this matter differs greatly in different parts of the country. The Y.M.C.A. claims to be undenominational, and welcomes among its members, not only Catholics but (at least in some places) Jews. It provides a program of lectures, instructions, social events, athletic facilities, etc., that offer a strong attraction to the average young person.

It cannot be denied that in its origin and spirit the Y.M.C.A. is Protestant. It was established in Scotland and England before the middle of the nineteenth century chiefly for the religious instruction and improvement of young Protestants of the working classes. As late as 1911 the *Encyclopedia Brittanica* stated that to be a member of the Y.M.C.A. "means a definite acceptance of the doctrines of the Evangelical Christian faith."[2] However, in the United States Catholics are admitted as members, though formerly it was the ruling that Catholics could not be elected to any of the superior or directing offices of the organization, and in some

[1] *AER,* CXXXIV, 2, 3, (February, March, 1956), 98-108; 190-200.

[2] *Encyclopedia Brittanica,* ed. 11 (1911), "Young Men's Christian Association," XXVIII, 940.

chapters the number of Catholics admitted to membership could not be more than five percent of the whole group.[3] However, I have been informed by an official of the organization that nowadays these restrictions no longer exist and that Catholics may be members of the board of management and hold other official posts.

As to the moral problem of the participation of Catholics in the activities of the Y.M.C.A., it is very evident that they may not take part in any religious functions, for these are surely Protestant in character. Neither could they attend Bible classes, religious lectures, etc. At most, it would be permissible for a Catholic to join the Y.M.C.A. in order to take advantage of the athletic facilities, and perhaps some of the social or cultural functions.[4] From this, however, it does not follow that every boy or young man must be permitted to join the organization as long as he promises to restrict his interests to the social, cultural and athletic features. Some Catholic youths would be spiritually endangered even if they were limited to these spheres of activities, either because they are not staunch in the faith or because in the particular chapter efforts are being made to weaken the loyalty of Catholics to their Church. Hence, a priest should carefully consider the case of each Catholic boy who wishes to join the Y.M.C.A. in order to benefit by the features that in themselves are not opposed to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. For the particular circumstances may render such affiliation wrong, even though the mode of affiliation may not be in itself sinful. It should be noted that the spirit of indifferentism—the notion that differences of religion are unimportant—is more dangerous than positive opposition to the Catholic Church. It is this fact that induced the Holy Office, in 1920, to warn Catholics against affiliation with the Y.M.C.A.[5]

As to the participation of Catholics in the Y.M.C.A. as members of the board of directors or other officials, I cannot see any other solution than an absolute denial unless the office is

[3] Cf. *AER*, LXIV, 3 (March, 1921), 242-49; LXVI, 3 (March, 1922), 297-99.

[4] By licit cultural functions I mean such events as lectures on literature or history, classes in the study of languages, etc., provided no anti-Catholic spirit is injected into them.

[5] Cf. *AAS*, XII (1920), 595-97.

definitely restricted to non-religious functions. How can a Catholic consistently take an active part in promoting a movement that supports Protestantism, or at least proposes all forms of Christianity as good and commendable? Similarly, it is utterly inconsistent for a Catholic to take part in a membership drive for the Y.M.C.A., thus suggesting that Protestant youth be encouraged to profess and practice Protestantism fervently, if he is convinced that the Son of God established only one religion, the Catholic religion, for all mankind.

The solution of the question of Catholic co-operation toward the work of the Salvation Army follows very logically from the principles just enunciated. The Salvation Army is a Protestant movement, in which many sincere and good Protestants participate. But it is not a movement in which Catholics may actively participate. When this organization inaugurates a drive for a particular purpose that involves no distinctively Protestant activity —such as Thanksgiving or Christmas dinner for the poor—it is surely lawful for Catholics to contribute. But to co-operate toward the spread of the organization in itself, which includes the propagation of non-Catholic doctrine, is entirely forbidden to those who believe that Jesus Christ established only one religion, and that the religion which He established is promulgated only by the Catholic Church.

THE JEWISH PASCHAL MEAL

In connection with the Passover celebration the Jews partake of the paschal meal; and sometimes a Catholic is invited to the repast by a Jewish family. May the Catholic accept this invitation? I have consulted Catholic scholars familiar with the Jewish religion on this point, but I hesitate to give a definite answer. The point at issue is whether or not the paschal supper is to be regarded as an official liturgical function of the Jewish religion or merely as a family meal with some religious accessories of a private nature. The latter seems to be the more probable interpretation; nevertheless, I recommend that a Catholic who receives such an invitation courteously decline. His Jewish neighbors may have invited him in a spirit of sincere friendliness, without any intention of having him violate his conscientious convictions. But, since there are surely some religious connotations connected with

the meal, it is at least the better procedure for Catholics not to be present.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATIONS

In some parts of our country the clergymen of different creeds form a society known as the "Ministerial Association," or some such similar title. Sometimes the local priest is invited to become a member of this organization. I earnestly exhort Catholic priests to refrain from membership. Beyond doubt, the invitation in many instances proceeds from a sincere desire to promote good will and friendship among the different clergymen of the community; and this in itself is a desirable good. But by joining an organization of this kind the priest implies that his ministerial office is on the same plane as that of the Protestant minister; and our faith teaches that the priest is elevated by his ordination to a dignity immeasurably superior to that of any other human being.

The priest may and should collaborate with non-Catholic clergymen toward the social and moral improvement of the community. He can, for example, join in movements to procure better housing conditions, to protect public schools from Communistic infiltration, to eliminate racial segregation, etc. And certainly, in his association with non-Catholic clergymen he should ever manifest the courtesy and kindness that are expected of one whose life is supposed to be an outstanding exemplification of Christian charity. He could even address a meeting of the Ministerial Association to explain the teachings of the Church, though in such an event he must be sure that he has first obtained the permission of the Ordinary—at least if the meeting can be classed as a *disputatio* or a *collatio*.[6] But when there is a question of association with non-Catholic clergymen in a way that implies equality of ministry with them and the acceptance of their creeds as something good, the priest must take an uncompromising stand and decline to enter such an association.

PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF NON-CATHOLIC LITERATURE

The problems of co-operation in the matter of the publication and the distribution of non-Catholic books, magazines, pamphlets, etc., are numerous in these days when the business of publishing

[6] Can. 1325, § 3; "Instructio S. Officii de Motione Oecumenica," *AAS*, XLII (1950), 142-47.

and selling various types of reading matter is so extensive. Only the more common problems can be considered in this brief discussion, but the general norms will be presented.

A Catholic may never, for any reason whatsoever, publish a book or article that upholds false religious doctrine. For the publisher of a piece of literature co-operates formally in proclaiming the doctrines that it proposes and defends.[7] This principle applies both to errors in faith (for example, a work that denounces Christian revelation) and to errors in morality (for example, a book defending contraception). This same prohibition applies to the Catholic owner of a printing plant.

However, those who work in a publishing house or printing plant without any right to determine what books are to be published are only material co-operators with respect to the spread of error and the harm it may do to readers. Hence, in certain circumstances they may licitly hold their jobs—namely, if there are sufficiently grave reasons to render their particular type of material co-operation permissible. The proximity (in importance and influence) of their co-operation and especially the frequency with which books containing false doctrine are published are the main factors to be considered in determining whether or not these workers may be permitted to continue their tasks. Thus, the linotyper certainly needs a graver reason to work on a book proclaiming a false religion than the man who loads the printed copies on a truck. Generally speaking, if an establishment only occasionally prints a book that contains false doctrine, the workers are allowed to keep their jobs; but it is difficult to see how a Catholic could work in any capacity in a printing plant that specializes in anti-Catholic literature. Even those whose co-operation is quite remote could not be allowed to remain, except, perhaps, for a brief time, until they can get another job.[8]

Those who publish books by apostates, heretics or schismatics upholding apostasy, heresy or schism incur *ipso facto* an excom-

[7] It would not necessarily be wrong to publish a book in which false doctrine is enunciated, as long as the publisher makes it known that he is not approving of the error—for example, when it is published with a refutation, or when an erroneous statement of some individual is merely reported as a fact. We are referring to the case of a publisher whose act of publishing a book is reasonably interpreted as an approval of its contents.

[8] Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1938), n. 767.

munication specially reserved to the Holy See.[9] The printer as such does not incur this censure, though he might be included under it indirectly—namely, as a necessary participant.[10] However, this would seem to refer only to the owner of the plant, not to the workmen. The norms laid down above would have to be applied to determine whether or not their material co-operation is justifiable.

Catholics who own bookstores may not expose to sale (*venales ne habeant*) books forbidden by the Church, either by name in the Index or by the general norms of Canon 1399. However, they may retain privately forbidden books (except those that *ex professo* treat of obscene subjects) and sell them to persons whom they prudently judge may lawfully read them.[11] Thus, a bookseller could keep in some secluded place books that attack Catholic doctrine and sell them to priests (or lay persons) who have received permission to read them.

Those who work as clerks in a bookstore conducted by non-Catholics are permitted to retain their jobs if the store, for the most part, carries good books—not, however, if it specializes in false or immoral books. In the former situation the clerks could sell even prohibited books to those who ask for them. The same rule can be followed by an attendant in a public library. In the words of Bishop Pernicone:

> A librarian in such public institutions is allowed to use some discretion as to the persons to whom he gives books and as to the kind of books he lends. A Catholic librarian is bound, as far as he is permitted, to use this power for the observance of the laws of God and of the Church in this matter. However, since he is a servant of the library, when he has used all that discretion which the library statutes permit him, he cannot be obliged further. Therefore, he need not ask everyone who requests a forbidden book whether he has permission or not; if he did so, he might lose his position. Besides, it is impossible to know whether every person coming to the public library is baptized and therefore bound by the laws of the Church; it is also impossible for him to know all the publications which are forbidden.[12]

---

[9] Can. 2318, § 1.

[10] Cf. Pernicone, *The Ecclesiastical Prohibition of Books* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1932), p. 229.

[11] Can. 1404.

[12] Pernicone, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-9.

PUBLICATION AND SALE OF PROTESTANT BIBLES

Particular attention must be given to the problem of the publication and sale of Protestant Bibles by Catholics. As to the publication, the matter is clear from the Code of Canon Law. One who publishes an edition of the Sacred Scripture without ecclesiastical approbation (and certainly this applies to one who publishes a Protestant Bible) incurs *ipso facto* an excommunication *nemini reservatam.*[13] While this excommunication can be taken away by any confessor in the sacramental forum,[14] the confessor cannot absolve one from this censure unless he promises to give up the work of publishing this type of Bible.

As to the sale of Protestant Bibles, Church law is more lenient. As was stated above, Catholic booksellers could keep such Bibles in stock (privately) and sell them to persons who presumably have the right to read them. Now, according to the prescriptions of the Church, those who are engaged in theological or biblical studies may use Bibles published without ecclesiastical approbation, provided they have been edited faithfully and integrally and the dogmas of Catholic faith are not impugned in their foreword or footnotes.[15] I have been informed by competent Scripture scholars that many Protestant editions of the Bible today measure up to these conditions. Hence, Catholic book dealers may sell such Bibles to persons engaged in theological or biblical studies.[16] Under this category of theologians or biblical students would come, not only priests and seminarians (in their Scripture course), but also lay persons who are seriously devoted to theological or biblical studies—for example, the Catholic college student preparing for an examination on the Bible in his religion course.[17] It should be emphasized, however, that ordinarily the Catholic lay person will find all that he requires for his intellectual and devotional needs in the Catholic edition of the Bible with its helpful notes. Furthermore, in quoting passages from the Bible, either in speech or in

[13] Can. 2318, § 2.

[14] Can. 2253, § 1.

[15] Can. 1400.

[16] However, the same Scripture experts informed me that there are some editions of the Bible that contain dangerous attacks on the faith, such as the Jehovah's Witnesses edition.

[17] Cf. Pernicone, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

writing, Catholics should use a translation approved by Catholic ecclesiastical authorities. In those places where public schools begin their classes with a reading from the Bible the Catholic teacher should bring her own Bible to school and read it.[18]

What about the sale of Protestant Bibles to Protestants by Catholics? Catholics working for non-Catholic book dealers as salesmen, whether in a shop or by a house-to-house procedure, may certainly sell such editions as do not distort the true text and contain no attacks on Catholicism (such as the present King James edition, the Authorized Translation, the Chicago edition) to Protestants who request them. But, may a Catholic who owns a book shop keep these editions and sell them indiscriminately to non-Catholics? If the store is definitely known as a *Catholic* book store, I would answer in the negative. For, it would savor of scandal for a store professedly committed to the sale of books approved by the Church to sell indiscriminately those that are explicitly rated as forbidden books by Canon Law. However, if the establishment is a book store of a more general character, though in the ownership of a Catholic, a more generous policy might be followed in regard to the editions of the Bible just described. For, it would seem, these books are not forbidden by *divine* law, since they present the inspired word without distortion or deceptive omissions. Indeed, they are good and inspiring in their message. Hence, if their sale to non-Catholics is forbidden it is only because of ecclesiastical law; and there are some authors who hold that the Church's laws on forbidden books do not bind even baptized non-Catholics.[19] At any rate, the Church law itself implies a solution to Catholic book dealers who would wish to sell Protestant Bibles to all who request them. For the Code prescribes that book dealers shall not expose for sale forbidden books *unless they have received permission from the Holy See,* thus implying that such permission may be given.[20]

[18] Cf. Connell, "The Catholic Public School Teacher," *Morals in Politics and Professions* (Westminster, Md., 1946), p. 157.

[19] E.g., Augustine, *A Commentary on Canon Law* (St. Louis, 1919), VI, 454. Most authorities do not regard this view as sufficiently probable. However, one might defend the practice suggested on the ground that it is a lesser evil for non-Catholics to have a Bible that is good in itself, even though forbidden by Church law, than not to have a Bible at all.

[20] Can. 1404.

Hence, I recommend that a Catholic book merchant who deems he has sufficient reason to sell Protestant editions of the Bible to all who ask for them seek permission from the Holy Office to sell them indiscriminately.

ATTENDANCE AT CREMATION

The law of the Church commands that the "bodies of the faithful shall be buried," and "reprobates their cremation."[21] From this it can be inferred that (apart from most extraordinary circumstances) a Catholic may not assist, even passively, at the cremation of one who was a Catholic, since his mere presence would be regarded as an approval of this forbidden method of disposing of the body. It is true, the decrees of the Church allow for a case in which funeral rights and ecclesiastical burial can be granted to one whose body is cremated, not at his own request but at the instance of other persons; but this will be allowed only when scandal can be prevented.[22] But even in such a case a Catholic must absent himself from the cremation, even though he might attend the funeral rites and the interment of the ashes. In the case of a non-Catholic a somewhat more lenient judgment must be passed on Catholics who wish to assist, because the law forbids cremation only with respect to "corpora *fidelium* defunctorum." I believe, however, that even in such an instance attendance would be wrong because it would be a source of scandal to those who cannot make fine distinctions. But there would not seem to be any objection to the presence of a Catholic at the funeral rites of such a person in a church or home, if the conditions for passive presence laid down by Canon 1258, § 2, are verified.

The participation of a Catholic undertaker in a funeral that is to terminate in cremation offers a practical problem. If the deceased was a Catholic who, in defiance of the Church's prohibition, stipulated that his body was to be disposed of in this way it is difficult to see how a Catholic undertaker could lawfully take charge of the funeral. But if the deceased was a non-Catholic, a Catholic undertaker could conduct the funeral, including the

[21] Can. 1203, § 1.

[22] *Collactanea S.C. de Prop. Fide*, n. 1665; *AAS*, XVIII (1926), 282-83.

delivery of the body to the crematorium. Material co-operation of a remote nature could be allowed to a Catholic working in the crematorium—for example, a clerk recording the cremations, a laboring man washing the windows and corridors—but not the proximate (or even formal) co-operation of one who is deputed to the actual task of burning the corpses.

SECRETARIAL WORK

A Catholic could serve as secretary to a non-Catholic clergyman if her work consisted regularly in assistance of a secular nature, such as writing letters regarding the management of a hospital, making arrangements for social affairs, etc., but not if her usual work was copying sermons, making arrangements for church services, etc. In this latter case, the co-operation would be material; but it would be so proximate that it is difficult to find a reason to justify it. The case would be different if the secretary's employer were a non-Catholic business or professional man who would occasionally dictate a letter pertaining to religious activities. In such circumstances the slight co-operation thus rendered would be sufficiently balanced by her normal desire to retain a good position.

SUMMER SCHOOLS AND KINDERGARTENS UNDER NON-CATHOLIC AUSPICES

Catholic parents are sometimes invited to send their small children to vacation schools or kindergartens under non-Catholic church auspices; and often the advantages to an over-worked mother are very tempting. However, such a procedure is entirely forbidden if the children are to receive any form of non-Catholic instruction, engage in Bible-reading, or recite non-Catholic prayers. If none of these features are present, it would not be *per se* wrong for a Catholic child to attend, but even in this event it is possible that the children will be subjected to non-Catholic propaganda or the spirit of indifferentism. Hence, Catholic parents should be urged not to accept an invitation of this kind, even though the intentions of those who give it are evidently most sincere and generous. Their good will does not make up for the real danger to the faith of Catholic boys and girls from attendance at such schools.

CONCLUSION

Doubtless many non-Catholics would characterize as casuistical and even pharasaical the distinctions and the details that have been made in this series of articles on the co-operation of Catholics in non-Catholic religious activities. But that realization should not deter the Catholic priest from making an earnest effort to acquire the requisite knowledge to guide his people aright in the many practical problems on this matter that they encounter in present-day America. Probably, too, there are some theologians who would take a different view from myself on some of the solutions I have proposed, and to this there can be no reasonable objection as long as they safeguard the principles of Catholic theology and the declarations of the Church.

But, above all, it is important that priests keep constantly before their people the vast distinction between charity and tolerance, on the one hand, toward persons of other creeds, and compromise in religious truth on the other. To all we must show the charity of Christ, whatever may be their particular religious beliefs. Here in the United States we must be most conscientious in granting full civil equality to non-Catholics. The Catholic who would vote for a Catholic because he is a coreligionist and refuse his vote to a non-Catholic more worthy of office would thereby commit a sin. But in religious matters, when the teachings of Jesus Christ as proposed by His Church are at stake, we cannot yield even though we thereby draw down ridicule and the charge that we are bigoted and narrow. We must be willing to endure any temporal evil rather than be guilty of disloyalty to the one true faith to which God in His mercy has called us.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE PRIEST AND LOCAL HISTORY

At a recent national convention of historians a Catholic lay professor—one who has achieved prominence among his fellow craftsmen of all and no beliefs—was given an opportunity to coin a telling phrase. One of his colleagues remarked about the presence of many Catholic priests at the gathering; to this the Catholic historian replied, "They belong here. They not only profess history, they are history."

Certainly in any American community there is no one person in whose position more history is capsuled than in the priest. He is essentially one in function and position with the wandering band which covered the Mediterranean world with the new and good news of the Gospel. In him is contained the same civilizing and spiritualizing force which greeted the barbarians pouring into Europe. He is a reminder of an age when faith put an ideal and an ethic into social relations between men. Men in the same clerical state as the most prosaic American pastor were responsible for much of the still visible grandeur that makes Europe so much more meaningful to the Catholic. The priest of today in the United States sums up a history of a Church suspected in the ignorance and imperial tensions of colonial days, accepted graciously with revolutionary magnanimity, and later feared for its strength of foreign origin in men and money. The American priests stand out not only among the notable missionaries and educators of all times, but also as assimilators of the immigrants whose sons make up a strong part of the American fabric.

There is in the American priest not only this epitome of all the history of western civilization, but in a special sense of his own American Catholic tradition. What a shock, therefore, it must be in many communities to find the man who is the most "historical" figure in their midst to be lacking in interest—not only in history in general but even in his own immediate historical background. The professional historian who is a priest hears the lament in expressions like, "Reverend, I wish you could do something to interest your people here in their own local history." The apathy has been made all the more startling by the increased production of works in the more general areas of American

Catholic history which come to the attention of those interested in the history of the nation even in its local aspects.

The most facile explanation of such lack of clerical interest in area or diocesan history would be the general spirit of American Catholicism which might be called "a" if not "anti" intellectualism. What then of our centers of clerical study? The study of American Catholic history—the whole scope of it—for a semester or two has not yet become the commonplace in our seminaries that it should be. Imparting the *magnalia Dei* of religious communities is wisely part of the training of their members, but one wonders from the available studies how much of the American chapter is covered even in those houses of study. The diocesan or provincial seminary would seem to be the logical place to introduce men in training to what is the Catholic history and tradition of the very area in which they will exercise their apostolate. In this regard the historical, anthropological, sociological, and in places, linguistic training of foreign missionaries is probably something that should be imitated on the home scene. Could not some combination of seminary faculty be used to give such a basically historical appreciation of his mission field to the American seminarian?

As might be suspected when priests are so often ignorant of the Catholic history of their surroundings, their lack even of interest in general state or local history is more notable. The historical societies on the city, county, and state levels are generally ignored by them—even when such organizations might be of great service, as, for example, in the preparation of parish histories. Perhaps, there is an anti-recent-immigrant, old American, even nativist tinge about some of their groups so that the priest would hardly be as much at home among them as the Protestant minister. In one such establishment the writer once heard an Irish-American priest described, with no intention to offend, as bright although just Irish. In another he found a Catholic employee who did not feel at ease announcing his religion too loudly.

It would be grossly unfair, however, even to intimate that the professional employees in state and local historical societies do not get enthusiastic about devotees of local Catholic history. Anyone who has enjoyed their help in tracing a Catholic question can vouch for the contrary. Across the country there strings a group of Catholic priests who constantly enjoy their respect and

cooperation. There are—and these are but some examples known to the writer—William L. Lucey, S.J., in New England; Robert F. McNamara in upper New York; John K. Sharp in Long Island; Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., in the Mid-West; Peter Leo Johnson in Wisconsin; George Paré in Michigan; William N. Bischoff, S.J., in the Northwest; and Maynard Geiger, O.F.M., in California.

Over and above these professionals there are several bishops for whom state and local historians likewise grow enthusiastic. Bishop Laurence J. FitzSimon of Amarillo, with his supervision and active work on the Texas Catholic collection, is one. The fact is quite clear in Texas that the Church is interested in its history because of the bishop's zeal for the collecting of printed material and film copies of documents pertaining to the development of the Faith there. Across the South in Mississippi, Bishop Richard O. Gerow of Natchez has so ordered his diocesan archives that there is not only arrangement but ready access through elaborate finding aids to information desired. The priests of the Diocese of Natchez regularly hear reports at their conferences drawn from the archival material, and in that way learn much about the history of the Church throughout Mississippi. A prelate from the past was hardly typical of high level ecclesiastical interest in local history. Robert Seton, titular Archbishop of Heliopolis, and grandson of Mother Seton, was so at home with the historical society in New York City that he left it his bull of appointment and some personal diaries for its manuscripts collections!

In some places a stimulus to and outlet for interest in the local history of the Church for prelate, professional, and parochial priest continues to exist in the form of Catholic historical societies. The quarterly *Records* still originates from the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, but its professed interest is the whole field of the Church's history in this country. Similarly in New York there emanates from the United States Catholic Historical Society an annual volume entitled *Historical Records and Studies* and a monograph on some phase of American Catholicism. In the case of both of these groups subjects of local interest seem to have had preference from their editors more in the past than in these days. Such local societies even in terms of numbers compared to the past (to say nothing of an attempt to evaluate vigor

of activity or bulk of membership) seem to be on the wane. There were some years back not only meetings but also publishing activity in centers like St. Louis, St. Paul, and Pittsburgh. Perhaps the separate Catholic historical society on the local level was in origin a phenomenon of "ghettoism" reaching out for the respectability of proving historically how much Catholics belonged in American society. Certainly the day has long since arrived for at least the professional historians in the American field—clerical and lay alike—to be aware of, or better yet to affiliate with, the general local historical organizations. In the case of the parish priest the direction of his intellectual interests and reading habits would make a difference, but if they run to American history he can profit by, as well as add to by his special interest, the function of such organized efforts in the field. The parochial clergy as educated and "historical" men should at least have a sympathetic interest in local history work. A corollary of this would be appreciation for the historical sites and monuments of their area, and it might be likewise hoped a respect for the neighboring archives and historical manuscript depositories.

American Catholics are hardly, at least on any wide scale, genealogically conscious. But they are now mature enough to be historically conscious. Some progressive Catholic school curriculum builders are getting the students ahead of the clergy in their knowledge of their local Catholic past. The seminaries and clerical conferences may soon have an added reason to keep their members up to date on the *res gestas a Deo* through their predecessors. To know so much as a narrowly confined segment of the history of the Church is to appreciate the broader setting of the modern Church, into which it fits. It is for the priest a way of knowing his flock, all of the people in the area, and knowing them in the manner of Christ, who appreciated His people also through their history and their prophets.

HENRY J. BROWNE

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

SOME RECENT WRITINGS IN THE FIELD OF FUNDAMENTAL DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

Part I

Within the past few months a great many books and articles have appeared on topics within the field of fundamental dogmatic theology. I believe that it would be helpful to mention and to set forth a brief critical evaluation of some of them in *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

Among the most useful works to have been imported into this country for a long time is the two-volume *Theologia fundamentalis,* by Fr. Joseph Mors, S.J. The revised second edition of this manual was printed in Argentina in 1954.[1] Father Mors' books are outstanding for the brilliant accuracy of their teachings. They are written in elegant and eminently readable Latin. They are effectively geared to the intellectual needs of mid-twentieth-century students of sacred theology. The theological proofs they contain are genuine demonstrations.

As its title indicates, the first volume, *De religione revelata,* begins its study of apologetics with sections on the nature and the necessity of religion. The remainder of the book is a magnificent treatise on revelation. Future editions of this volume could be improved considerably by the completion of Father Mors' accurate but somewhat inadequate introduction to sacred theology.[2]

The second volume, *De ecclesia Christi et de fontibus revelationis,* is certainly one of the best manuals available today. Perhaps more than any other modern author, Father Mors knows how to employ the documents of the Church's *magisterium* for the explanation and the proof of his theses. Of special interest is his teaching on the doctrinal authority of the Roman Pontiff even in those cases where he does not exercise the plenitude of his apostolic authority.[3]

Another volume, which will be immensely important here in the United States, is an English translation and revision of Monsignor

[1] The work is published by "Editorial Guadalupe" of Buenos Aires. The first volume runs to 379, the second to 370, pages.

[2] Cf. Mors, *Theologia fundamentalis,* I, 14-18.

[3] Cf. *ibid.,* II, 170-77.

Van Noort's *De vera religione,* published by the Newman Press as *The True Religion.*[4] The translators are the well-known Sulpician Fathers John J. Castelot and William R. Murphy of St. John's Provincial Seminary, Plymouth, Michigan. *The True Religion* is the first of a ten-volume translation of Monsignor Van Noort's dogmatic works projected by Fathers Castelot and Murphy.

Monsignor Van Noort's *De vera religione* has long been a standard text in Catholic schools. It was an excellent book to translate into English, especially since, by reason of the fact that it passed through no less than five editions in the original Latin, it had attained a relatively high state of literary and scientific perfection. The translation itself is felicitous.[5] Those portions added to the original text for the benefit of American readers are, for the most part, quite acceptable.

The True Religion will undoubtedly prove very popular and will deservedly go into many future editions. It is to be hoped that in future printings of this work the somewhat haphazard bibliographies will be improved. A work as important as *The True Religion* should have a much more complete list of writings on the subject, particularly of books and articles in English.

The Fides Publishers Association of Chicago is bringing out another translation of a series of theological textbooks. This one is the *Theology Library,* the English version of the well-known *Initiation théologique,* a French series directed and edited by Fr. A. M. Henry, O.P. The English translation of this series is being directed by Fr. Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., of Notre Dame University. The first volume, *Introduction to Theology,* contains chapters by eight French theologians and has been translated by William Storey.[6]

From the points of view of doctrinal accuracy, clarity of presentation, effective proof, and timeliness, the manuals of Mors and

[4] *Dogmatic Theology.* Vol. I, The True Religion (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1955). Pp. lviii + 324. $6.00.

[5] In a very few places the translation could be improved. Thus, on p. 281, the expression "after a fashion" is employed as the equivalent of the Latin "quodammodo." Actually, the English term carries a derogatory nuance wholly absent from the Latin.

[6] *Theology Library.* Vol. I, *Introduction to Theology* (Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1954). Pp. xiv + 306. $5.95.

Van Noort are excellent works. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the *Introduction to Theology.*

In the line of doctrinal accuracy, the first volume of *The Theology Library* fails more through incompleteness and misdirection than by open misstatement. A few examples may serve to illustrate the basic tenor of this work.

Father Liégé, in the most important section of the book, the chapter on "The Sources of the Christian Faith," uses the word "Tradition" to designate the deposit of divine public and supernatural revelation. He has this to say about it.

> If, then, the deposit of faith remains ever the same, that supposes a transmission, a *tradition.* This notion of Tradition is important to retain. The closed Revelation becomes Tradition. Where can we find the Word of God? *In Tradition.*
>
> However, in order that this answer have the sense it should for us, we must strip the idea of Tradition of whatever habitual, static, passive, or conformist notions it may contain. The phrase "traditional Christianity" can possess great meaning. Generally, however, we use it in a derogatory fashion.[7]

It would be most unfortunate if some poor student in a Catholic college or university were to take seriously Father Liégé's insistence that we must "strip the idea of Tradition" of anything it actually contains. He is speaking of the body of divine public revelation delivered by the Apostles to the Catholic Church, to be preserved inviolate and taught authoritatively and infallibly by the Church until the end of time. No one has a right to "strip" anything at all from the Catholic notion of tradition. Furthermore, it is at best misleading to infer that the concept of Tradition in the Church carries with it any elements or ideas which should be done away with.

Moreover, a student would be seriously misinformed if he were to believe that within loyal and intelligent Catholic circles the expression "traditional Christianity" is ever employed in anything like "a derogatory fashion."

Father Liégé uses the plural "traditions" to designate the *fons revelationis* distinct from Sacred Scripture. His use of the term

[7] *Ibid.*, 6.

is somewhat confusing since most recently the encyclical *Humani generis* spoke of this same source of revelation as *"traditio."*[8]

Father Liégé gives a highly imperfect account of the relations between the two sources of divine public revelation.

> A question still remains: namely, to know whether Scripture and the traditions are complementary expressions of God's Word, or whether Scripture alone already contains the whole Word. If we conceive the mystery of Christ as a living whole and not as a collection of principles to be believed and practiced, we have many reasons to think that the apostolic preaching which was consigned to writing transmits to us the entirety of the mystery. Such was the thought of the Fathers of the first centuries, on condition, evidently, that Scripture was read in the Church.[9]

The section of Father Liégé's article from which this passage is taken is drawn up in the form of a commentary on a declaration of the Council of Trent, repeated in the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius,* and restated in the *Humani generis.* According to this declaration, "the truth and discipline" of the Gospel, or, in the wording of the Vatican Council, "this supernatural revelation," is said to be "contained in written books and in unwritten traditions."[10] What Father Liégé has done has been to confuse this teaching rather than explain it.

In the first sentence of the passage cited above, Father Liégé has set forth a question. If, as it appears to do, the term "Word" in that sentence refers to the deposit of divine public revelation, there is only one answer to the question he has raised: the Scripture alone does not contain the entire content of God's revealed message. For one thing, it does not enumerate and identify the inspired books themselves. If the term "mystery of Christ" in the second sentence has the same meaning as "Word" in the first one, then Father Liégé's answer is inaccurate. If, on the other hand, it does not have that meaning, he is not dealing with the question he himself has raised.

The idea of "the mystery of Christ as a living whole and not as a collection of principles to be believed and practiced" is in line with

[8] Cf. the Latin text in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXIII, 5 (Nov., 1950), 389.

[9] *Introduction to Theology,* 11 f.

[10] Cf. *Denz.,* 783, 1787, 3013.

the spirit of Father Liégé's article. For instance, he has this to say about divine revelation.

> Revelation certainly contains doctrine. God "attacks" us as intelligent beings to whom He gives Himself by an objective determination of the mind's assent. But, more than truths about God, it gives us the very Person of God and His Person through His plan of salvation: Theology through Economy, to use the vocabulary of the Greek Fathers.[11]

What Father Liégé has said here and with reference to "the mystery of Christ" is certainly patient of acceptable explanation, albeit that explanation must be somewhat forced. The divinely revealed message is a body of supernatural teaching about the Triune God, and about the path we must follow in order to possess Him forever as our ultimate End. It brings us into salutary contact with God. By charity we love God as we know Him through His revealed message which we accept with the assent of faith. In the act of Christian hope, we confidently desire God, known through His revealed message, as our ultimate End. In the act of faith, we accept God's message as certainly true, not by reason of the intrinsic evidence of the statements contained in that message, but on the authority of God Himself revealing.

Yet the terminology of Father Liégé tends to be quite misleading. The obvious implication of his teaching is that divine revelation contains doctrine and something else, and that there is a legitimate and real distinction between the revealed mystery of Christ considered as a living whole, and considered as a collection of principles.

In point of fact, revelation, objectively considered, is a body of doctrine, a collection of judgments or statements which God has supernaturally communicated to men through His Son. It is not exact to say that it *contains* doctrine. Objectively considered, divine revelation *is* doctrine.

In the same way, when Father Liégé writes about "the mystery of Christ as a living whole," as distinct from this same mystery "as a collection of principles to be believed and practiced," his terminology is not characterized by the clarity and exactness which should be found in the language of a theologian. Actually, the

[11] *Introduction to Theology*, 5.

things God wills that we should believe are, as the Vatican Council puts it, "mysteries hidden in God, which could not be known if they had not been divinely revealed."[12] These mysteries are truths, expressed in statements or propositions, and presented to us as dogmas of the Catholic Church.

The dogmas of the Church can be designated as a collection of revealed principles which we are meant to accept as true with the assent of divine faith, and which are also meant to be normative for our conduct. At the same time, however, they constitute a living whole, in the sense that "the word of God is living and effectual."[13] God's supernatural revealed message is designated as "living" when it is considered as emanating from or contained in God Himself. In this sense it is identified with the divine essence, since there is absolutely no composition in God.[14] As it is delivered to us, it really is a collection of revealed statements or propositions. In neither sense, obviously, is the entire content of divine public revelation contained in Scripture. And there is certainly no way in which we come in contact with God in this world through His revealed message apart from our acceptance of these revealed statements or truths with the assent of divine faith.

What Father Liégé has to say about Catholic dogma is definitely unsatisfactory. It would be unfortunate if Catholic students were to take seriously a passage like the following.

> It is important, for pastoral reasons, to remark that defined dogma retains in its formulation only the objective and enunciable aspect of revealed truth; it abstracts from the personal and dialogue fashion which characterizes Revelation; it is a kind of quintessence of truth to which we can refer for doctrinal security, but which points back to the living and personal Word. Besides, it is by its very nature partial, fortuitous, concerned with only a *given* aspect of the mystery in question. Consequently, there is always a risk of giving a controverted matter such attention that it would seem to be of paramount importance.[15]

---

[12] *Denz.*, 1795.

[13] *Heb.* 4:12.

[14] Cf. the explanation of this passage by William Estius, in his *Commentarii in epistolas apostolicas* (Paris, 1679), II, 910.

[15] *Introduction to Theology*, 21 f.

It is regrettable that a passage like the one just cited should ever be included in a book of religious instruction intended for Catholic students. It would be interesting to know in what way defined dogma "abstracts from the personal and dialogue fashion which characterizes Revelation." According to our standard Catholic teaching, the message which we accept with the assent of divine faith is a mediate rather than an immediate revelation. The propositions which God wills that we should believe are delivered or preached to us by the Catholic *magisterium*. The Catholic dogmas are precisely those truths which the Church finds in Scripture or in divine apostolic tradition, and which it presents to us, either in solemn judgment or by its ordinary and universal *magisterium,* as truths which have been revealed by God and which are to be believed as such by all men.[16] Catholic dogma, then, does not "abstract from" any value of revealed truth at all. There is no more "personal" approach to the revealed message than the way of Catholic dogma available in this life.

The designation of Catholic dogma as "a kind of quintessence of truth to which we can refer for doctrinal security" is a masterpiece of understatement. It is not the sort of teaching which could by any stretch of the imagination be deemed valuable or even acceptable for serious students of the Catholic faith. And to describe dogma as something "by its very nature partial, fortuitous, concerned only with the *given* aspect of the mystery in question" is utterly unscientific.

Throughout the key articles in *Introduction to Theology* there is a confusion of language that tends to make the book very difficult reading. In his Introduction to the volume, Father Putz, the chief translator of the series, warns the reader that "Some parts will seem obscure and difficult at first."[17] Unfortunately, however, the difficulty found in this volume does not come from

[16] Cf. *Denz.*, 1792.

[17] *Introduction to Theology,* xii. Father Putz also recommends this work with the somewhat disquieting assertion that it "tries to avoid arriving at fixed conclusions, but leads to further thought and study of the subject matter." Any worthwhile work in sacred theology or any other science for that matter certainly "leads to further thought and study of the subject matter." A good book of theology, however, should definitely not try "to avoid arriving at fixed conclusions." The truths of the Catholic faith are very fixed truths indeed, and sacred theology is essentially the *scientia fidei.*

any profundity of doctrine, but rather from a slipshod terminology and fuzzy thinking.

One manifestation of this inadequacy is in the direction of euphemism with reference to doctrinal deviation. Thus we read in Father Liégé's article:

> The Church does not pass judgment on the Word of God since she is contemporaneous with and witness of that Word; but she has power over the interpretation of the written word in order to insure a greater interior fidelity, and she judges an interpretation of the Word: whether it is a too exterior reading of the Scripture, rather than the Word itself.[18]

Presumably in this context the "Word" refers to the deposit of divine public revelation. This passage seems to be trying to bring out the truth which ordinary books of fundamental dogmatic theology would express by saying that the message proposed by the Church as truth to be believed with the assent of divine faith is not something composed by the Church itself, but rather a body of revealed teaching which God has commissioned the Church to guard and to preach authoritatively and infallibly. In point of historical fact, the ecclesiastical *magisterium* has never moved in the rarified atmosphere of this new theology. It has not rejected any doctrines because they constituted "a too exterior reading of the Scripture." Whatever doctrinal material the teaching Church has repudiated and condemned over the course of the centuries has been stigmatized for the much more prosaic reason that the offending teachings have been heretical, erroneous, or deserving of some other theological censure.

Characteristic of the volume as a whole is the attitude with reference to non-Catholic religions and religious bodies expressed by Father Henry.

> Before terminating these aspects of the various religions, we want to indicate a final mine for research, namely, the theological situating of each religion in relation to divine revelation and the Catholic religion. What will be the principle of classification and judgement or can there ever be one?
>
> Since we have admitted that a religion cannot be simply a collection of errors (under pain of not existing at all), but that it contains a

---

[18] *Ibid.*, 13.

certain amount of truth, small as it may be, the theologian must humbly recognize this truth. And since our God, the God of Abraham and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is also the God of all creation, and the God of all men, the theologian recognizes the hand of God at work each time that he comes upon men who profess a certain religious truth. All religions, because of the particles of truth they retain, minute as they may be, possess in part what the Church also possesses, but in its fullness. It would seem that this must be our principle of judgment.

It goes without saying that this classification will judge differently the non-Abrahamic religions from those of Judaism and Islam, or from all those religions which claim to stem from Christ. In reference to the principle we have enunciated, the "Orthodox" Church, for example, not only *possesses* a portion of what the Church possesses, but in very great part *is* what the true Church is.[19]

The "principle" set forth by Father Henry, that "All religions, because of the particles of truth they retain, minute as they may be, possess in part what the Church also possesses, but in its fullness," is quite familiar to English-speaking theologians. It is the old and thoroughly discredited teaching of the Modernist Von Hügel. This "principle," incidentally, is one of the dominant themes of the recently re-issued *Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece*.[20]

The trouble with this "principle" set forth by Father Henry is that it runs counter to the claims of the Catholic Church itself. The ecclesiastical *magisterium* has never limited itself to the assertion that the Church possesses in full measure the body of religious truth which other religious communities enjoy only in a partial or fragmentary manner. It clearly states that God has entrusted His revealed message to the Church and has commissioned and empowered this society to teach and to guard this body of teaching infallibly until the end of time.[21] Any body of religious teaching that contradicts the divine message proposed by the Catholic Church

[19] *Ibid.*, 291.

[20] Cf. *Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955), pp. 63 f.; 115 f. This aspect of Von Hügel's teaching is described briefly in Fenton, "Von Hügel and His Spiritual Direction," in *AER*, CXXXIII, 2 (Aug., 1955), 117-22.

[21] Cf. *Denz.*, 1957, 2145.

must be considered as a counterfeit of God's public revelation to mankind.

Father Henry seems to evaluate religious teachings after the manner of a schoolteacher marking his pupils. When a schoolboy gives correct answers to seven out of ten questions in an examination, and misses the remaining three, he is said to deserve a mark of seventy. He is rightly given credit for the truth he knows, and is penalized for his mistakes. *Introduction to Theology* depicts the Catholic Church as an institution deserving of a perfect mark. It describes the other religious bodies as social units deserving of lesser marks, but actually entitled to credit for what they acknowledge in the department of religious truth.

As a matter of fact, however, this approach to the problem of religious evaluation is demonstrably inadequate. The Catholic Church and other religious units all present bodies of teaching which they describe as God's revelation to mankind. The teaching set forth by the Catholic Church actually is what it claims to be. Any religious teaching which contains elements opposed to the content of Catholic dogma and which is offered to men as divine revelation, as something which men should accept on faith, is objectively a counterfeit. A counterfeit as such is dangerous precisely in proportion to its degree of excellence as an imitation.

If, during the course of a war, an enemy intelligence service were to intercept some message directed by a supreme commander to his troops in the field, it would clearly be to its advantage to change the tenor of that message and see to it that the false orders were delivered in some plausible way to the men to whom they were originally directed. It would likewise be to its advantage to change the original message as little as possible in the attainment of its own objectives. In such a case the orders actually delivered to the soldiers would be false. It would be extremely unrealistic to praise them as containing elements of truth.

Similarly, it is distinctly to the advantage of counterfeiters of money to make their products resemble the genuine article as closely as possible.

The divine public revelation God has given to mankind, and which he has entrusted to the Catholic Church alone, is actually the set of directions man must use for the attainment of his one eternal and supernatural end, the possession of the Triune God in

the glory of the Beatific Vision. This revelation does not contain any useless elements. Thus, if some body of religious teaching retains some statements which have actually been revealed by God, but denies any dogma, this body of teaching should not be considered as a more or less close approximation of the actual revealed message, but as a dangerous counterfeit. It would be worse than idle to designate some religious teaching which denies the divinity of Jesus Christ as something coming from the "hand of God."

Moreover, it is completely misleading to say, as Father Henry does, that "the 'Orthodox' Church, for example, not only *possesses* a portion of what the Church possesses, but in very great part *is* what the true Church is." The true Church, the Roman Catholic Church, is actually God's kingdom on earth. It is the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ Our Lord. None of the various religious units usually designated as "Orthodox" communities is the kingdom of God or Christ's Mystical Body in any way whatsoever.

With its "soft" approach to individual non-Catholics and to non-Catholic religious groups, the *Introduction to Theology,* in line with the established traditions of "progressive" theology, associates the employment of billingsgate against its Catholic opponents. Thus Father Liégé speaks of "the frivolity and ignorance of certain Catholics"[22] who do not agree with his interpretation of the Vatican Council's definition of papal infallibility. Father Liégé holds that the Roman Pontiff can exercise his charism of infallibility only in his extraordinary or solemn *magisterium.* In the encyclical *Humani generis* the Sovereign Pontiff asserts that the words: "He who hears you, hears me," are verified in his own ordinary *magisterium.*[23] A great many competent Catholic theologians have taught, and, despite the charge of "frivolity and ignorance," will continue to teach, that the Holy Father can speak infallibly in a document of his ordinary teaching activity.

There are good sections in the *Introduction to Theology.* Nevertheless, because of its numerous and glaring deficiencies in the line of doctrinal accuracy and clarity of presentation, the volume is definitely unsatisfactory as a textbook for religious instruction.

[22] *Introduction to Theology,* 20.

[23] *Denz.,* 3013.

Recently, Father Charles Journet's first volume of his *The Church of the Incarnate Word* has been made available in an English translation by A. H. C. Downes. The first volume of this series is entitled *The Apostolic Hierarchy*.[24]

Father Journet's first volume is far superior to the second of the series.[25] Despite its rather labored divisions, and despite a couple of weak sections (a somewhat misleading treatise on "Catholic Oecumenicism" in which far too much importance is attributed to certain teachings of Father Congar, and an inadequate, though long, treatment of Church and state), *The Apostolic Hierarchy* is an excellent book, which any priest can read with considerable profit.

On only one basic point will the reader find *The Apostolic Hierarchy* seriously misleading: on Father Journet's explanation of inclusion in the Church. Here is what he has to say on this subject.

> The word Church may be taken, and I shall in this book take it, in its *formal,* or *ontological,* or *theological* sense. So taken it indicates the Church in her entirety, body and soul together. But it indicates the Church alone, pure and unmixed, to the exclusion of all that is other than herself.
>
> Looked at in this way, the Church is composed of just men and sinners. But that statement needs further precision. The Church contains sinners. But she does not contain sin. It is only in virtue of what remains pure and holy in them, that sinners belong to her—that is to say in virtue of the sacramental characters of Baptism and Confirmation, and of the theological habits of faith and hope if they still have them. . . .
>
> Similarly we can say that the Church contains the just; but precisely in so far as they are just. To the extent to which, besides the profound choice of the will that unites them to God, they still

---

[24] *The Church of the Word Incarnate: An Essay in Speculative Theology,* translated by A. H. C. Downes. Vol. I. *The Apostolic Hierarchy* (London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955). Pp. xxxi + 569. $7.50.

[25] The second volume of Father Journet's work, *Sa structure interne et son unité catholique* has not as yet appeared in English. The French original was discussed in Fenton, "Father Journet's Concept of the Church," in *AER,* CXXVII, 5 (Nov., 1952), 370-80.

harbour a region of shadows, a concession to venial sin, to that extent they are partially outside the Church. . . .

Thus the frontier of the Church passes through each one of those who call themselves her members, enclosing within her bounds all that is pure and holy, leaving outside all that is sin and stain, "more piercing than any two-edged sword and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and the marrow, and discerning the thoughts and the intents of the heart."[26]

This should be considered in the light of Father Journet's teaching about the material cause of the Church, understood in various ways. Thus, for him, the material cause of the Church taken in the "restricted sense" is "the human nature of the Christians who make up the faithful."[27] The material cause of the Church understood in the "intermediate" sense is "the human nature of the Christians, hierarchy and faithful."[28] The material cause of the Church seen or understood in the "large" sense is "the human nature of Christ and of Christians."[29]

In actual fact, the Catholic Church, the *congregatio fidelium,* as the classical ecclesiologists called it, is a society, an assembly of men, rather than a collection of virtues. A baptized person remains within the Church as an actual member as long as he does not break the outward or bodily bond of the Church's unity. Father Journet's mention of "the frontier of the Church" as something that "passes through each one of those who call themselves her members" is at best only a confusing metaphor. A man's body can be partially inside a room, and, at the same time, partially outside of it. In this sense the boundary or frontier of the room passes through his body. This analogy, however, does not in any way help us to understand the relation of the Catholic to the Church of which he is a member or a part.

A Catholic in the state of mortal sin is within the true Church as a member. At the same time he is within the kingdom of Satan, the perpetual and bitter enemy of the Church by intention or desire, in much the same way that the non-member of the Church who is actually saved died as one within the true Church of Christ *voto seu desiderio.* The Catholic who dies in the state of mortal

[26] *The Apostolic Hierarchy,* xxvii.
[27] *Ibid.,* 46.
[28] *Ibid.,* 47.
[29] *Ibid.,* 49.

sin will find himself for all eternity contained within the social unit to which he was attached *voto seu desiderio* at the moment he departed this life, just as the non-Catholic who dies in the state of sanctifying grace will live forever in the next world in the social unit to which he was attached *voto seu desiderio* at the moment of his death.

Nevertheless, the Church militant of the New Testament is a genuinely visible society. Its members or parts are individual men and women. They are recognizable as genuine members. It is thus highly misleading to teach that the boundaries of the Church pass through those who are truly members of the Church in such a way that they could be described as partly within this society, and partly outside of it. Neither venial sin nor mortal sin can render a man only partially within the Catholic Church as a member. The public profession of heresy, apostacy, or schism will take away membership in the Church. No other offenses against God directly affect this membership at all.

We must not forget that, after all, the Catholic Church is made up of men. The supernatural beneficent forces within it perfect and determine, not human nature precisely, but the men and women who possess this human nature. Hence the process of designating human nature as the "material cause" of the Catholic Church is not completely acceptable from a pedagogical point of view.

Taken as a whole, however, Father Journet's *The Apostolic Hierarchy* is a satisfactory, even a rewarding, theological work. Another translation from the French, the symposium *Tolerance and the Catholic,* is unfortunately quite deficient in the line of doctrinal clarity and accuracy.[30] This volume, published last year, is a translation of papers delivered at or resulting from Doctrinal Meetings held at La Sarte, in France, in October, 1951.

Eight papers are published in *Tolerance and the Catholic*. By all means the most important of these papers, one on "The Theological Conditions of any Pluralism," was written by Fr. Yves Congar. "The object of the present paper," Father Congar assures us, "is to bring out from the point of view of Catholic theology the conditions or principles that must govern any co-operation between

[30] *Tolerance and the Catholic: A Symposium.* Translated by George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955). Pp. ix + 199. $3.50.

men of different beliefs, or, beyond any positive religious faith, between men who do not even share the same outlook on ultimate realities and ultimate ends."[31]

Actually the essay is drawn up somewhat loosely in the form of an article in the *Summa theologica.* The precise point at issue is not stated, but the material which is placed in the position of the series of objections at the beginning of one of St. Thomas' articles is, in Father Congar's essay, a reference to the Church's insistence on avoiding the "wrong kind of liberalism."[32] The *sed contra,* in this case, is a statement of certain facts, the first of which is described in the statement that "In the new conditions of the modern world, a new kind of relationship has grown up between the Church and the world or temporal society, i.e., a new way for the Church to fulfil her mission in the world and society."[33] In Father Congar's mind, this "new kind of relationship" or "new way for the Church to fulfil her mission in the world and society" seems to be found in the process of having "the Church's prophetic word striking the consciences even of those who do not believe."[34] The author asserts that "Those familiar with these matters will recognize this as what is called—in a phrase that might easily be misconstrued—the Church's 'directive power.' "[35] He adds: "It does indeed seem as though this is the line along which the Church is developing today."[36]

It is against this background that Father Congar has written one of the strangest paragraphs found in any Catholic book in recent years.

> Perhaps the situation can be satisfactorily explained from the Catholic point of view by means of a distinction which seems to me to be applicable to several problems in which, in our affairs today, what might be described as a closed, monolithic attitude comes up against a more open attitude which is nevertheless free from any taint of the wrong sort of liberalism. It is a point not sufficiently noticed that the word "Church" embraces a number of elements which are not all to be found in the same level. There is the Church as a dogmatic organization and an apostolic magisterium. As such she cannot but assert the truth of which she is the guardian in all its purity and denounce the indigence of all that does not absolutely

---

[31] *Ibid.,* p. 166.
[32] *Ibid.,* pp. 167-71.
[33] *Ibid.,* p. 171.
[34] *Ibid.,* p. 172.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*

conform to that which has been deposited within her. She cannot but be intransigent. Further, since she holds this fund of truth from on high, and contains it entirely within herself, she has in this respect nothing to receive from what is outside her. But there is also the Church as a religious organization living in history, which she transcends by her origin and essence, but within which she leads her concrete life; from this point of view she exists in and through her members, and is subject to the conditioning to which they are subject. They learn and receive from others and from history; she learns and receives in them. They live in a composite world and are themselves a composite of Christian and non-Christian—the only thing is that they try to enable the Christian to give light to the non-Christian, both in themselves and in the world. Only the Church as a magsterium exists in a state of pure "thesis"; in her members, in the historic life she leads in them in the world, she is always in a state of "hypothesis" —and the consequences to which this state leads go far beyond the question of the submission of the political power to the authority of the priesthood.[37]

The "distinction" employed here by Father Congar is set forth in lamentably inexact terms. It tends to lead to a still more unfortunate implication. According to the wording of the paragraph cited above, the Catholic Church "as a dogmatic organization" would not seem to be living and working in the world at all. Actually, of course, the teaching activity of the Church is and always has been exercised in the world of men. The most important documents of the *magisterium* have been produced in order to guard the faithful and to warn those who are not members of the Church against errors and misleading doctrinal tendencies by which the salvation of their souls were endangered. In point of fact, there is no function of the Catholic Church which takes more cognizance of world conditions and tendencies than the ecclesiastical *magisterium*. It is completely misleading to teach that "the Church as a religious organization living in history . . . within which she leads her concrete life" is distinct in any way from "the Church as a dogmatic organization and an apostolic *magisterium*."

The statement that "Only the Church as a magisterium exists in a state of pure 'thesis'; in her members, in the historic life she

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 185 f. Oddly enough this particular section was selected for special commendation by Mr. Erwin Geissman in his review of *Tolerance and the Catholic*, in *The Commonweal*, LXIII, 6 (Nov. 11, 1955), 145 f.

leads in them in the world, she is always in a state of 'hypothesis,' " is, insofar as it has any real meaning at all, quite manifestly inaccurate. The basic trouble with this statement is to be found in its complete flouting of the elementary laws of semantics. In the section of Catholic theology with which Father Congar is dealing at this point, the terms "thesis" and "hypothesis" have regularly established meanings. The truth that objectively a state, like every individual human being and every group of human beings, owes God the tribute of worship and thus should worship Him according to the only divinely authorized religious rites, those of the Catholic Church, was and always will be the Catholic "thesis." And, according to this same received terminology, in the "hypothesis" that some great good could be obtained or some serious evil averted, or that it was practically impossible to have the state worship God according to the rites of the Catholic Church, it was allowable or even laudable to have the state to refrain from any exclusive attachment to the true Church. In his encyclical *Immortale Dei* Pope Leo XIII, without employing the words "thesis" and "hypothesis," gives an accurate expression of the teaching in which these two terms are properly and intelligibly used.

> The Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or of hindering some great evil, allow patiently custom or usage to be a kind of sanction for each kind of religion having its place in the state.[38]

Thus the Church is in the "state of pure thesis" neither as an apostolic *magisterium* nor in any other way. The "thesis" is simply a statement of fact. To say that the Church is in a state of "thesis," or, for that matter, in a state of "hypothesis," is to make a statement objectively meaningless, and yet tending to imply that the Church, in its teaching work, acts in a kind of social vacuum.

It is noticeable also that in this citation from Father Congar's article, the author shows the same kind of false delicacy about the

[38] This translation is found in Father Wynne's edition of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 127.

doctrinal condemnations issued by the Church that we observed in Father Henry's *Introduction to Theology*. It is not exact to say that the Church is compelled to "denounce the indigence of all that does not absolutely conform to that which has been deposited within her." The Church has not condemned and does not condemn mere doctrinal poverty. It denounces and repudiates heresies, errors, and teachings which are so couched that they tend to deceive the people for whom Our Lord died and to whom He directed God's revealed message.

The same paragraph also shows an acceptance of the teaching manifest in Father Journet's book, to the effect that the frontiers of the Church pass within and through the Church's own members. According to Father Congar, the members of the Church "are themselves a composite of Christian and non-Christian."

The other articles in *Tolerance and the Catholic* run, in general, pretty much along the line traced by Father Congar. One of them, "Freedom of Faith and Civil Toleration," by Father Léonard, actually quotes with approval the opinion of a non-Catholic Englishman who claims that the Church has no right to protest against persecution in the communist countries as long as the Spanish government continues to act as it does with regard to non-Catholic religious groups.[39]

In the line of doctrine and of clarity, *Tolerance and the Catholic* is notably deficient. It is a book that tends to foster undesirable and unrealistic attitudes towards the Church and its teaching activity.

(*To be continued*)

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[39] Cf. *Tolerance and the Catholic*, p. 99.

Answers to Questions

THE BISHOP'S TEACHING AUTHORITY

Question: In our diocese the Ordinary has publicly denounced race discrimination, stating that it is morally wrong because it is opposed to the Catholic doctrines of the unity of the human race and the universality of the Redemption. Some Catholics are asking about their obligation to accept this teaching of the Bishop. What is the type of assent, if any, that must be given to such a pronouncement of a local Ordinary? Would it be sufficient if Catholics merely observed a respectful silence, without internal acquiescence? Or, can we presume that this is all the Bishop is demanding?

Answer: According to the Code of Canon Law, expressing a fundamental truth of Catholic faith: "Bishops, although individually or even when gathered in particular councils they do not enjoy infallibility of teaching, are nevertheless true doctors or teachers, under the authority of the Roman Pontiff, of the faithful committed to their care" (*Can.* 1326). Our present Holy Father in his address to Bishops on May 31, 1954, *Si diligis,* stated: "Christ Our Lord entrusted the truth which He had brought from heaven to the apostles, and through them to their successors. . . . The apostles are, therefore, by divine right the true doctors and teachers in the Church. Besides the lawful successors of the apostles, namely the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church and Bishops for the faithful entrusted to their care, there are no other teachers divinely constituted in the Church of Christ" (*AER,* CXXXI, 2 [Aug., 1954], 133. Cf. Fenton, "The Papal Allocution *Si diligis,*" *AER,* CXXXI, 3 [Sept., 1954], 190).

From this it follows that Catholics are *per se* obliged to accept the doctrines officially proposed by their respective local Ordinaries. The assent which *per se* they are bound to render is religious assent—a true internal assent, not merely respectful silence. We say that *per se* they are bound to give this assent, because in a particular case a Bishop might err in his pronouncement, and in this event one who is learned in the matter involved and is convinced that the Bishop has made a mistake need not (and cannot)

give internal assent. But such a case is very rare. In the words of Hervé: "(Bishops) are by divine law the teachers of the faith for the faithful assigned to them; for these therefore they must propose revealed doctrine, and forestall and condemn errors; and their subjects are bound to obey them (*Heb.* 13:17), unless it is evident that they are departing from the doctrine of the See of Peter, in which case they are to be judged, not by their subjects, but only by the Sovereign Pontiff" (*Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* [Paris, 1952], I, n. 487). It is absurd to hold that when a Bishop authoritatively teaches a doctrine as contained in or connected with Catholic faith he is presumed to be demanding merely external acquiescence. Such an idea is utterly destructive of the Catholic principle that the teachings of the authentic *magisterium* of the Church determine the intellectual assent of the faithful.

As far as the particular doctrine adduced by the questioner is concerned, there can be no doubt that the Catholic Church teaches that it is sinful to deprive any citizen of our land of any of the rights accorded to citizens—domestic, civil, educational, economic—merely because of his race or color. In the first place, this is not the statement of one Bishop only, but of many Bishops—and the number is rapidly increasing. It should be remembered that these statements are known to the Holy See, and the Holy See has not condemned them—as it would have done if they were erroneous. Furthermore, the Holy See has positively and definitely expressed its condemnation of the notion that some races are superior to others. Such was surely the mind of Pope Pius XI, when he denounced in his Encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge* the "so-called myth of race and blood" (*AAS,* XXIX, 151). A decree of the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, issued on April 13, 1938, with the approval of the Sovereign Pontiff, vigorously condemned the Nazi principle of the intrinsic superiority of certain races (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* II, 396).

Finally, to repeat the arguments of the Bishop in question, any intelligent and honest Catholic should realize that it is utterly impossible to reconcile discrimination against any human being because of his race or color with the Catholic doctrines that all men are descended from the same first parents, that all have been redeemed by Jesus Christ and that all are equal in the eyes of the Catholic Church.

SUNDAY WORK

Question: In our part of the country it seems to be taken for granted that Catholics may lawfully work on Sunday in building a house or cottage as a vacation residence. Many Catholics think they are justified in undertaking this task, whether for themselves or for others, on the score that necessity or charity furnishes the sufficient reason. Some have stated that their pastor gave them a dispensation. What is to be said of this custom and the arguments adduced to support it?

Answer: Several years ago, in discussing the problem of Sunday work performed by a young married man anxious to have a house of his own, I stated, with reference to the man himself and his charitable friends willing to help him:

> In the first place, the Catholics in the group must attend Mass every Sunday, for the case indicates no reason why they should be excused from this obligation. As far as the prohibition of servile work on Sunday is concerned, it would seem that they have an excusing cause, in view of the circumstances that prevail in our country today. Certainly, there is a deplorable scarcity of proper living accommodations for young couples. And this situation is undoubtedly an occasion of many grave sins, such as domestic dissension and birth control. Accordingly, a young married man in need of a home, who is engaged on a regular job during the week and finds it possible to build a house within a reasonable time only by working on Sunday, would undoubtedly be allowed to do a full day's work every Sunday during this period. The same reason would justify the collaboration of a group of kindly friends (*AER,* CXX, 4 [April, 1949], 343).

The present problem is somewhat different, since the house in question is intended as a vacation residence for a family who presumably already possess their own home. Moreover, the case is not restricted to a young married couple. However, if those who seek this exemption from the Church law forbidding Sunday work are persons who would find it very difficult to pay for the erection of a house, and if they can work on their house only on Sunday, I believe that they can be allowed to undertake this job, and also that they may be assisted by their charitable friends. For, it is a great boon for a family to have a vacation house in the country or at the lakeside. It is presumed, of course, that all Catholics

participating in this project shall first have assisted at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The most commendable course for Catholics in this situation is to seek a dispensation from the local pastor, who is empowered by Canon 1245 to grant such a dispensation to individuals and to families.

SUNDAY MASS

Question: What is to be said about Catholics who miss Mass on Sunday because they have gone into the lake region or the woods for the purpose of hunting, fishing, etc., over the weekend?

Answer: It is a deplorable fact that in recent years the sin of missing Mass on Sunday has become more common among Catholics in the United States. Priests should recognize the danger to the faith inevitably connected with this custom, and strive to avert it by impressing our people with the importance of Sunday Mass in Catholic life. It is true, there can be legitimate reasons excusing a Catholic from the obligation of attending Mass on Sunday; but these reasons should not be inordinately extended. The motive of recreation is an example of a reason that may be stretched too far. It is held by reliable theologians that if a person can obtain needed recreation only in a section of the country, or only in circumstances, in which he cannot hear Mass, he can be justified in taking his recreation in this place or in these circumstances and thereby missing Mass *once or twice,* or at most *a few times a year* (Cf. Fanfani, *Manuale theoretico-practicum theologiae moralis* [Rome, 1950], III, n. 79; Konings, *Theologia moralis* [Boston, 1874], n. 408). However, Catholics should be told that this concession may not be used except when there is considerable difficulty in getting to Mass from the place of recreation, and that it may be used only rarely (*once or twice* a year, according to Fanfani; *a few times* according to Konings). In these days of automobiles and motorboats, Catholics can generally get to Mass even from remote parts of the woods and the lake regions. Certainly, a person would not be excused from attending Mass merely because the journey to church would take an hour by car (Cf. Guiniven, *The Precept of Hearing Mass* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942], p. 143). And

a Catholic can make use of recreation as an excusing cause only when he cannot find the needed recreation in a place where he can get to Mass on Sundays.

DIVORCE AMONG JEWS

Question: May a modern Jew find justification for divorce and remarriage in the Mosaic Law enunciated in Deuteronomy, 24: 1-4, since he does not accept the law of Christ and regards himself as still subject to the divine law proclaimed by Moses?

Answer: Beyond doubt, the average modern Jew is justified *subjectively* in seeking a divorce with freedom to contract another marriage, when he adduces the passage referred to by the questioner, in which the Almighty permitted the men of the Jewish people to divorce their wives under certain conditions. But this *subjective* disposition does not make the act *objectively* permissible. The law of Moses was abrogated by Christ, whose authority as God extends over all mankind. He restored the primitive law of the indissolubility of marriage, apart from the few exceptions which He allowed to be granted through His Church, such as the Pauline Privilege, the dissolution of the *matrimonium ratum non consummatum,* etc. As He Himself proclaimed: "Moses, by reason of the hardness of your heart, permitted you to put away your wives; but it was not so from the beginning" (*Matt.* 19:8). Hence, the divorce and remarriage of the modern Jew, however sincere his subjective disposition, are opposed to the law of God, and hence are invalid.

KILLING IN DEFENSE OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: If a person is profaning the Blessed Sacrament, is it permissible for a Catholic to kill him (presuming no other means will prevent his evil action) in order to protect the Holy Eucharist from sacrilegious insult?

Answer: It would seem that this is not one of the cases in which one may kill an unjust aggressor (even presuming that no

other means is available to prevent the desecration of the Blessed Sacrament) if only the act of profanation is involved. Thus, if the culprit is fleeing with the Blessed Sacrament, with the evident purpose of profaning It, a Catholic would not be justified in shooting him with a probable danger of inflicting a mortal wound. The reason is that, although one who profanes the Blessed Sacrament is guilty of a heinous crime, he is not really doing any harm to Our Blessed Lord, because His sacramental state makes it impossible for Him to suffer any physical injury, no matter what indignity may be inflicted on the sacramental species. (For this reason the Code of Canon Law, in Canon 2320, speaking of profanation of the Blessed Sacrament, designates it as an irreverent act with reference to the *sacred species,* rather than to the *Body of Christ.*) The principal factor of sin in such a case is the blasphemous intention of the violator. Hence, just as it would not be permitted to kill one who is blaspheming in order to put a stop to his sinful speech, so it would not be permitted to kill the man who is profaning the Blessed Sacrament, in order to prevent this irreverence, if only the act of profanation is involved.

However, it would surely be lawful—and at times obligatory—to use some measure of force in order to prevent the sacrilegious act. Furthermore, in stating that one may not go so far as to kill the wicked individual "if only the act of profanation is involved," I intend to imply that if one who seeks to profane the Blessed Sacrament attacks a priest carrying the Blessed Eucharist with the evident intention of injuring or killing him in order to fulfil his evil designs, the priest may defend himself against this attack even to the extent of killing the unjust aggressor, if this is the only way in which he can protect himself.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

On February 4, Pope Pius XII addressed the delegates of the International Conference on Human Relations in Industry. His Holiness lamented the fact that progress in the improvement of working conditions for laborers in industry has been too slow in many instances. He stated that the Church is ever interested in the relations between labor and management because she keenly appreciates the dignity of man. Since Christ died for all men, he said, all men are equal in dignity before God and, therefore, they should be equal in the free and necessary relations which unite them. He emphasized the responsibility of the employer to realize that the laborer whom he hires is more than a source of production: he is a human being, a member of human society, a person who is working for the welfare of society. Every man said the Pope represents a transcendent value for the Author of human nature has given him an immortal soul. It behooves society, he concluded, to study the factors which can contribute to the improvement of human relations in industry with a universal consciousness of the individual's dignity.

Businessmen all over the world should be alert to the words of praise of the Pope for their ranks. On February 18, on the occasion of an address to the Italian Confederation of Commerce, the Pope stated that businessmen are very important for the structure of society. He observed that they should have a broad professional training, be alert to economic developments, foresee consumer trends, and have an insight into consumer psychology. Outlining the moral qualities desirable in businessmen, he said they should be courageous in times of crisis, preservering in overcoming their fears, and willing at all times to try new methods of operation. Government should strive to assist business rather than impede it by complicated regulations and restrictions. Likewise, he noted that businessmen have a right to hope that "taxes which are too numerous and too heavy" will not be imposed and "take away an excessive amount of the gains" rightfully won. Moreover, government should not substitute itself for private enterprise when the latter acts successfully and usefully. Continuing the examination of the relationship of government to business, the Holy Father touched upon the matter of social security sys-

tems. In many cases, he said, these systems have failed to end painful economic conditions. Social security systems should not impede business operations and run the risk of killing initiative and, even worse, he said, they should not place such restrictions on the employer that all his efforts are discouraged. He suggested that such systems might well be re-examined in some instances for "unfortunately it is a very human tendency to follow the line of least resistance, to avoid burdens and to exempt oneself from them by having recourse to the support of society and to live at its expense." The Pope then defended freedom of economic activity for businessmen, provided it be used to serve a higher liberty and be ready if necessary to limit itself so that it does not violate superior moral demands. Otherwise, he said, it will be difficult to halt the progressive trend towards a type of society whose economic and political organization is itself the negation of every freedom. The Pope then concluded with words of caution and admonition for businessmen. They must be alert to avoid three temptations: undue self-interest; the use of improper procedures; and, the pursuit of illicit profits. In their attempts at reform they should show a constructive spirit and respect all aspects of an economic and social reality which is very complex. Finally, he insisted, businessmen must always remember the essential values of the spiritual order which "remain the only ones which can save modern civilization."

An interesting insight into the person of the Pope is noted in his words to the Sports Club of Oran, Algeria, on February 18. He told them that sports have always been dear to his heart. He then reminded them that sports should be a training ground for the moral qualities of courage, endurance, and a sense of fair play, which qualities should be carried over into social life.

On February 18, also, the Pope had words of high praise for the United States. The efforts of the United States in the alleviation of the sufferings of the victims of Italy's severe winter were called by His Holiness "an admirable mission of charity." Regarding the charity of the people of the United States, His Holiness remarked that the world has come to associate charity with the generosity of "your great country so abundantly blessed by God."

Addressing a group of Brazilian seminarians on February 28, the Pope urged them to become men of study. The priest, he said, must possess a high degree of learning. His spirit should be open

to progress and capable of distinguishing true learning from false doctrine. Above all, he should know the sacred sciences so that he will never make compromise on any of the principles or doctrines of the Church.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for April, 1906, by Fr. Philibert Feasey, O.S.B., is entitled "The Paschal Candle." It presents some very interesting historical data about this liturgical feature of the Easter celebration. The author tells us that in the Middle Ages it was customary in many places to kindle a fire on Holy Thursday, from which the Easter candle was to be lighted. The paschal candles of the Middle Ages were indeed substantial tributes of faith. In one instance, a paschal candle with its candlestick reached the height of seventy feet. . . . Fr. H. Wyman, C.S.P., contributes an article criticizing the psychology expounded by W. H. Mallock, in *The Reconstruction of Religious Belief*. . . . Fr. Robert Benson begins in this issue his novel *A Mirror of Shalott*. . . . Fr. W. Goetzmann of Baden, Germany, writing on "The Essential Note of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," takes exception to the view of Bishop Bellord and proposes an opinion regarding the essence of the Mass which is very similar to that which Fr. De la Taille proposed about fifteen years later. . . . Fr. E. Divine, S.J., contributes another instalment of his novel, *The Training of Silas*. . . . In the Studies and Conferences section we read that the new *Kyriale*, approved by Dom Pothier, O.S.B., has been subjected to many criticisms. But, the anonymous writer assures us, since it has been approved by the Holy See, it should be accepted wholeheartedly by all Catholics. . . . A writer who signs himself "J.F.W." defends the idea that only male voices should be incorporated in a liturgical choir since "women do not and cannot express their devotional sentiments in voice of the pitch the so-called sacred song has demanded for some decades back.". . . . A correspondent makes the practical suggestion that when we build a church in a city we should put the chimney in front, because "if the pastor wants to save the church expense, and himself and his successors a good deal of worry, he should tell his architect that where the coal is dumped, there the boiler and chimney must be." F.J.C.

Book Reviews

THE NAMES OF CHRIST. By Louis of León. Translated by Edward J. Shuster. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1955. Pp. x + 315. $4.75.

The Names of Christ by the sixteenth century Augustinian, Louis of León, is a welcome addition to the Cross and Crown Series of Spirituality. From more than one viewpoint Fray Louis was an unusual man. Brilliant and outspoken, at an early age he became professor of theology and scripture at the University of Salamanca, and soon attracted large numbers of students; and, unfortunately, the hostile attention of many of his colleagues. For this young professor was far from tactful. At a time when religious non-conformists—even in the broadest sense—were wise in keeping their counsel to themselves, Louis definitely did not. A master of Hebrew and Chaldaic as well as Latin and Greek, he was vocal in his criticism of the Vulgate. For this and other imprudences he eventually incurred the displeasure of the Inquisition, spending, consequently, four years in prison at Valladolid. He was then luckily exonerated and reappointed to the faculty of Salamanca. Here he continued to teach for a good number of years. In 1591, nine days after having been elected Provincial of Castile, he died.

Written over a number of years, *The Names of Christ* is an ascetico-theological study of some fourteen scriptural titles more or less frequently applied to Christ—Bud of the Lord, Face of God, Arm of God—as well as the more common ones, such as Good Shepherd, Prince of Peace, and Son of God. This work is thoroughly scriptural and dogmatic, and its approach is happily positive and contemplative rather than apologetic or moral. Indeed it is refreshing to read an exposition of the meaning of the titles of our Lord in which scripture is really the *source* of what is said and not merely an ornamental appendage. For make no mistake about it. There is little, if any, of the strained and forced exegesis one might easily expect to find in a sixteenth-century writing. Accommodation there is, to be sure, but it is healthy and moderate. Our author is obviously at home with both the letter and the sense of scripture as few theologians are. A keenly sensitive man who had himself suffered much from what was in the main unjust animosity, Louis deeply lamented the indifference

of many theologians of his own day to scripture, the very source of all sound and vigorous speculation.

There is not a chapter in this excellent book that does not yield rich and satisfying food for thought and meditation. The author's insight, for example, into the Pauline concept of Christ as the summit of creation and of our solidarity with Him is particularly worthy of note (chap. 2, Bud of the Lord). Again, there are truly magnificent pages on the fitness of the title, The Good Shepherd (chap. 5). Louis' explanation of the title, Father of the World to Come (chap. 7), once more shows us how intimate he was with the thought of St. Paul. Finally, the study of Christ as the Bridegroom of the entire Church and of every just soul (chap. 11) reveals the heights of its author's own spirituality and the lyric beauty of his style and expression. It is interesting to note that Fray Louis makes his own the idea common to many of the Fathers that the Church began with the first just man on earth, was betrothed when Christ founded the visible Church, and will celebrate her marriage at the end of time.

Some concluding remarks. We are told in the Editor's preface that the present volume is not the complete treatise on the names of Christ and that there have been deletions and adaptations. Such a procedure is certainly legitimate; still this reviewer would have wished an indication of how this present volume compares quantitatively with the original and also a word or two on the nature and extent of the adaptations. Again, on pp. 32 and 234 there are footnotes to scriptural quotations, giving the different sense of the original Spanish of Fray Louis. Would not the reverse procedure have been in order: namely, a translation of Louis' Spanish in the body of the text, with a footnote giving the Douai—or other—reading? Finally, it does seem a pity that a pink dust jacket was chosen for such a strong and worthwhile book! This reviewer is not competent to judge the accuracy of the translation. Doctor Shuster's position as professor of Spanish at St. Louis University, however, seems to be ample guarantee. Certainly the translation reads smoothly; one is unaware that he is not reading an original text.

FRANK B. NORRIS

THE SAINT OF THE ATOM BOMB. By Josef Schillinger. Translated by David Heimann. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1955. Pp. 144. $2.50.

The "saint of the atom bomb" is Dr. Paul Nagai of Nagasaki, leading Japanese medical scientist, patriot, and Catholic layman. When he

died in May, 1951, after lingering nearly a decade with radiation sickness, contracted partly through his work as a roentgenologist and partly through exposure to the atom blast that levelled his native city in August, 1945, the fame of Dr. Nagai had become world-wide.

His tireless work among the survivors of the blast, in spite of poor health and grave personal injuries, earned for him the affection of our Holy Father, the title of National Hero from the Japanese Diet, the title of Honorary Mayor of Nagasaki from a grateful citizenry, an unprecedented personal visit from the Emperor of Japan, and a tremendous accolade in the world press. His twenty-odd books, written on his *tatami* (floor mat) of pain, made him perhaps the best-known and most widely-respected citizen of Japan; the books sold into the hundreds of thousands, were translated into many languages, and one of them, *Bells of Nagasaki,* was made into a motion picture of the same name.

In this brief but absorbing account, the author skillfully interweaves the story of Dr. Nagai with vivid sketches of the first atom test at Los Alamos, the fission factory at Hanford, the flight of the B-29 bombers with the terrible choice of one of two targets, and a history of the Christian colony at Nagasaki. These, together with vignettes from the doctor's personal history, form the background for a compelling account of human courage and saintly personal sacrifice.

The book is slightly marred by several errors, *viz.,* on p. 18 we read the "long-necked shamis," no doubt a reference to a Japanese musical instrument, the *samisen;* on p. 21 "Portuquese" occurs instead of "Portuguese"; on p. 23 we read a reference to the Cathedral of Nagasaki "where the pastor of Urakami enters for the Solemn High Mass as the Cardinal and Primate of East Asia," which titles do not exist in Japan; and on p. 135 the Apostolic Delegate to Japan is referred to as "the Apostolic Delegate, the Archbishop of Furstenburg," when actually *de Furstenberg* is the family name.

WILLIAM DENNIS RYAN

INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF METAPHYSICS. By Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1955. Pp. xix + 291. $4.50.

Father Koren states that his purpose in writing this textbook is "to serve as an introduction to the Thomistic theory of being in undergraduate schools were three or four credits can be devoted to this purpose." This seems to be the dominant motive in the composition of many of the modern textbooks in this field. While admitting that

this is a very realistic approach in view of the almost negligible time assigned to this important subject of metaphysics in perhaps most of our Catholic colleges of today, it is still a most unfortunate attitude to encourage and thus to perpetuate. It puts metaphysics in the position of a poor relation, a Lazarus at the gate, to whom a few crumbs might grudgingly be assigned while the largess is properly reserved for the true children of the household, the arts and the sciences. One would not think of assigning such a few credits to the important study of French, for instance. Indeed no credit at all would be given for a single semester of this language. But metaphysics is seldom granted a larger place, and that in the face of a Christian tradition to the contrary reaching back to the very beginnings of Christianity. Here is a subject upon which the very integration of rational knowledge depends, the *scientiarum rectrix* whose time assignment in the college curriculum is reduced to such a minimum as to make clear presentation most difficult if not impossible.

Under such essentially irrational conditions Father Koren covers the subject matter of Thomistic metaphysics in a clear and business-like manner along traditional lines. Our chief objection to that line is that it does not sufficiently stress the completely revolutionary approach which St. Thomas effected in even the very nature of metaphysics when he declared this philosophy of ultimate reality to be a unique inquiry into the exercise of an act of to be, whether it be limited by some possibility for existence which is the being's essence, or one whose very essence is to exercise such an act.

This brings us to the other limitation which has been traditionally placed upon this large subject of metaphysics to accommodate it to the meagre semester of three or four credit hours, namely its artificial division into so-called metaphysics of finite being and natural theology, presumably with the hope of securing an extra semester at the cost of destroying the essential unity of the subject: The act of *to be* by its very nature cannot be divided. Its very exercise in varying degrees by its limiting essence points immediately and necessarily to the Being whose essence does not limit its existence because its essence is to exist. If for no other reason than to get the whole field of metaphysics before the mind as soon as possible, this inference to Self-Existent Being must be immediately made as constituting the most proper object of this important inquiry. To delay the consideration of the only Being that truly is, the one true object of metaphysics, until the close of the inquiry is simply to make the real significance of this most unique approach to reality almost impossible. This is especially true when we appreciate the full force of the role of analogy in the exercise of metaphysical thinking in Thomism.

Yet Father Koren so completely yields his position to curriculum makers who seem to have no understanding of the subject as to say: "On several occasions references are made to God. General metaphysics does not presuppose God or take His existence for granted. In a special section of metaphysics, called theodicy, God's existence and nature are discussed. However, there are certain problems of general metaphysics which can be fully answered only if God is taken into consideration." This seems to us to be a remarkable concession, much like apologizing, for instance, for mentioning Hamlet in a play essentially about the Prince of Denmark. We may ask further just what problems in metaphysics can be fully and intelligently answered if God is not taken into consideration. Perhaps it is just this artificial division of metaphysics that is the source of some of the difficulty Father Koren mentions when he suggests there is no such thing as "metaphysics without tears." We think it is about time metaphysicians banded together to resist this attack upon the unity of their subject even in the face of administrators who consciously or unconsciously show their small regard for the traditional "ruler of the sciences" in assigning it less time than they would the most lowly of subjects in the curriculum.

CHARLES A. HART

FOR MORE VOCATIONS. By Godfrey Poage, C.P. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1955. Pp. 212. $3.50.

Experience, study and enthusiasm are the springs from which Father Poage has drawn eight of the most delightful and informative chapters on vocational recruiting that have yet appeared. His profound study brings to this work authenticity and reliability. His experience and success attest to its practicality, while his infectious enthusiasm and frequent use of examples render the entire volume highly readable. Father Poage has made good use not only of his own study and experience, but also of the opinions of a wide variety of fellow-experts in the vocational field as well as the pertinent papal pronouncements.

In his eight chapters he treats the following subjects: "Role of the Recruiter," "How to stimulate interest in vocations," "Recruiting from Special Groups," "Vocational Clubs," "Interviewing Prospects," "Judging Prospects," "Overcoming Parental Opposition," and " Recruiting Programs."

The two chapters on "Interviewing Prospects" and "Judging Prospects" describe the careful investigation which should precede the acceptance of the aspirant. In judging the candidate's intention, Father

Poage would not demand the advanced motivation expected of a mature religious. "It is enough for them to wish to dedicate their life to Our Lord, even without knowing well what the works of the institute comprise, provided that they remain content when the works are explained to them."

Speaking of the increasing importance of testing a person's attitude, disposition and personality, Father Poage adopts the general attitude that psychological tests can and do supply *some* additional knowledge about the applicant, but quotes Pius XI to support his contention that "no psychological test can ever be devised for testing a divine vocation." He adds "the whole purpose of these tests is rather to cut down the mortality rate of candidates by confirming or denying certain convictions regarding the natural fitness of an applicant in the screening process." Certainly it is wrong to view these tests with suspicion merely because "we have been getting along for years without them." Nevertheless we should heed well the warning of Father Ple, O. P.: "We must never become infatuated with psychoanalysis and psychological tests, nor yet must we let ourselves be tricked into rejecting everything to do with psychology. If we must not ask psychology for what it cannot give us, so too, we must not refuse to use those of its discoveries which are valid and scientifically established."

Father Poage's screening process involves much more than merely "going through the form." It is certainly reassuring to find such care recommended by an expert. It would be disastrous if, in the present need for vocations, communities were to lower their standards, aiming merely at filling their houses of formation at any cost. This is impressed on us by the example of Gedeon, so well quoted by the author. Gedeon had his army reduced from 32,000 to 300 as a result of the testing the Lord gave it; in spite of this Gedeon was still victorious. The cause of Israel did not suffer because of the high standards demanded of those who served it. "The same," says the author, "can be said of the church today. Though the requirements for the priesthood are high, still there are sufficient youths with all the necessary endowments of nature and grace. We must search them out, but in doing so, we must never lower the norms. Quality is more important than quantity."

The same competence is found in the remaining chapters. The author describes the personality and techniques of the recruiter, putting great stress on the former. He analyzes and refutes forty-two objections from parents; then on the basis of his association with "countless recruiters, research specialists, and interested parents," he proposes five general ways of dealing with the subject of parental objections. He gives detailed advice on how to make vocational appeals to high